FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-033
Friday
16 February 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-033 CONTENTS *16 February 1990*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Further Reportage on Shevardnadze's Ottawa Visit 1
  - Visit Summarized *[TASS]* 1
  - Interviewed on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 1
- Shevardnadze Attends Open Skies Conference *[cross-reference]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Vorontsov Remarks on Israeli Settlement Policy *[IZVESTIYA 14 Feb]* 3
- Further Reportage on Unification of GDR, FRG 3
  - Neighbors Fearful *[IZVESTIYA 14 Feb]* 3
  - Obstacles Outlined *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 4
  - Compromise Required *[Pogodin on Moscow International]* 5
- Modrow FRG Visit Deemed 'Favorable' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 6
- NATO's Woerner Meets Supreme Soviet Delegation *[TASS]* 7
- World Peace Council Elects New Leadership *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Shevardnadze Meets With Canadian Officials 8
  - Confers With Mulroney, Clark *[TASS]* 8
  - Further on 15 Feb Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 8
  - Meets Canada's Governor General *[TASS]* 9
  - Delivers Speech to Legislators *[TASS]* 9
  - Addresses German Unity Question *[TASS]* 9
- Bush Cited on Baker Visit, Summit Prospects *[IZVESTIYA 14 Feb]* 10
- Delegation Visits U.S. Military Installations 11
  - Stops at South Dakota Base *[TASS]* 11
  - Shabanov Comments on Exercises *[TASS]* 11
- Alekseyev on U.S. Defense Department Guide *[Moscow International]* 11
- News Conference on Exchanging Cadets With U.S. *[TASS]* 12

Northeast Asia

- MPR Head Quoted on Ties With USSR, China *[Moscow International]* 12
- Mongolian Diplomat on Foreign Economic Ties *[TRUD 6 Feb]* 13
- U.S. Cuts in ROK Force Levels Welcomed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]* 13
- Soviet-South Korean Symposium Opens in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 14 Feb]* 14
- DPRK Disarmament Institute Head Visits Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 6 Feb]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Ryzhkov Wraps Up Visit to Australia 15 Feb 15
  - Gives SS-20 Fragment to Museum *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 15
  - Attends Dinner Hosted by Hawke *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 15
  - Delivers Canberra Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 18
  - Concludes Talks With Hawke *[TASS]* 20
  - Further on Hawke Discussions *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 20
  - Reviews Soviet-Australian Ties *[TASS]* 21
  - TASS Reports News Conference 21
  - Moscow TV Covers Visit's End 23

- Departs, Flies to Singapore *[TASS]* ... 24

Ryzhkov Begins Official Visit to Singapore *[TASS]* ... 24

Near East & South Asia

Iran, Turkey's Interests in Azerbaijan Viewed *[Moscow International]* ... 24
NOVOSTI's Smirnov on Jewish Emigration *[London AL-MAJALLAH 20 Feb]* ... 24
Paper on Soviet Jews in Israel, War Threat *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Feb]* ... 25
Najibullah Grants Amnesty to Some Servicemen *[TASS]* ... 26
Peace Prospects for Afghanistan Examined ... 26
- Abdul Wakil Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* ... 26
- U.S. Stance: No. 1 Obstacle *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Feb]* ... 26

East Europe

TASS Cites CTK on USSR Troop Withdrawal ... 28
CSSR Defense Leadership, Policy Altered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Feb]* ... 28
Bogomolov Views Changes in East Europe *[CTK]* ... 28
Polish Defense Minister on Soviet Troop Presence *[TASS]* ... 28
Jaruzelski's Stand on German Issue Clarified *[TASS]* ... 29
- PRAVDA Account *[15 Feb]* ... 29

Caution Urged on German Unification *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 14 Feb]* ... 29
TASS Cites ADN on Monetary Union ... 31

Latin America & Caribbean

Commentary on Upcoming Colombia Drug Summit *[Levchenko on Moscow International]* ... 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

16 Feb Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported ... 33
- Resumes Discussing Property Bill *[TASS]* ... 33
- 'Soyuz' To Resist USSR Breakup *[TASS]* ... 33

Moscow TV Carries Supreme Soviet Coverage 15 Feb ... 33
- Lukyanov Chairs Session ... 33
- Abalkin on Ownership ... 34
- Kalmykov on Ownership ... 34
- Abalkin Answers Questions ... 35
- Vote Called on Proposals ... 35
- Call For Ownership Definition ... 36
- Inter-ethnic Strife Discussed ... 36

15 Feb Supreme Soviet Debates Reported *[TASS]* ... 37
Abalkin Briefs Supreme Soviet on Property Law *[Moscow Radio]* ... 37
- Dismisses Referendum on Law *[Moscow TV]* ... 38
- On Nature of Ownership *[Moscow TV]* ... 39

'Heated Debate' in Supreme Soviet Session Noted *[Moscow International]* ... 41
- Further on Property Debate, Abalkin *[TASS]* ... 41

Boyko Addresses Supreme Soviet on Economic Reform *[Moscow TV]* ... 42
Supreme Soviet Honors Memory of Afghanistan Dead *[TASS]* ... 42

Political & Social

Zaykov on February Central Committee Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* ... 43
Formulation of Presidential System Reported *[Moscow International]* ... 43
Constitution Commission Head on Gorbachev's Powers *[Moscow TV]* ... 43
Editor On Gorbachev, Independence *[GIMTASIS KRASTAS No 3]* ... 44
Miners Discuss Meeting With Gorbachev *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 4 Feb]* ... 45
Orthodox Leaders Cable Gorbachev on 'Disputes' *[TASS]* ... 46

- Biryukov: Ligachev, Gorbachev 'Working Together' *[London BBC TV]* 47
- Raisa Gorbachev's Influence Examined *[DAILY EXPRESS 14 Feb]* 48
- Paper Interviews Gorbachev's Interpreter *[MOSCOW NEWS No 4]* 49
- Moscow Poll on Political, Economic Reforms *[MOSCOW NEWS No 2]* 50

Tajikistan Situation

- Dushanbe Radio Reports on Tajikistan Situation 53
  - Area 'Returning to Normal' 53
  - Party Officials Appeal for Order 54
  - 'Special Broadcast,' Appeal to People 54
- Moscow Newspapers Update Tajikistan Events 54
  - Dushanbe 'Tense,' Information Scarce *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 54
  - Situation Called 'Extremely Grave' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 55
  - 14 Feb Confrontations Described *[TRUD 15 Feb]* 56
  - Dushanbe 'Relatively Calm' After Rally *[TRUD 16 Feb]* 57
  - Leaders Resign To Prevent Bloodshed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 57
- Moscow Radio Updates Tajikistan Developments 58
  - Internal Affairs Ministry Comments 58
  - Tajik Communists Hold Emergency Plenum 58
  - Roundup of Events *[Moscow International]* 58
- Situation 'Remains Tense,' 'Alarming' *[Moscow TV]* 59
- TASS Continues Reportage of Tajikistan Events 59
  - Leaders Reportedly Tender Resignations 59
  - 15-17 Feb Declared Days of Mourning 60
  - Disturbances Appear 'Organized' 60
  - Meetings Open; Information Shortage Noted 61
  - Situation Still 'Extremely Tense' 61

Regional Affairs

- Kirghiz Procuracy, MVD Appeal for Calm *[Frunze Radio]* 62
- Correspondent Views Kirghizia Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 62
- Turkmen Council of Ministers Appointed *[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 25 Jan]* 63
- Open Letter to Gorbachev on Caucasus *[KOMSOMOLETS 18 Jan]* 64
- Resolution Adopted on Aid for Azerbaijan Refugees *[PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 68
- Azerbaijan TV, Radio Chief Appointed *[KOMMUNIST 2 Feb]* 68
- Commandant's Administration Says Baku 'Peaceful' *[Baku Radio]* 68
- Situation in Baku City 'Improving' *[Baku Radio]* 68
- Foreign Journalists Visit Baku *[Baku Radio]* 69
- Statistics Workers Meet on Situation in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* 69
- Operational Staff on Situation in Armenia, NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
- Yerevan Reports Changes in Armenian Presidium *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
- NKAO 'Unstable'; Group To Meet Gorbachev *[Yerevan International]* 71
- Situation in Armenia Updated 15 Feb *[TASS]* 71
- 'Heated' Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Ends *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 71
  - Supreme Soviet on 1921 Decision on NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* 72
- Case Stated for Non-Ethnic Estonians *[PRAVDA 13 Feb]* 74
- Latvian Supreme Soviet Holds Session 15 Feb *[Riga Radio]* 75
  - Supreme Soviet Votes For Independence *[Riga Radio]* 76
  - Draft Declaration of Independence *[Riga Radio]* 76
  - Latvia To 'Work for Independence' *[TASS]* 77
  - Gorbunov on Latvian Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 77
- Latvian Resolution on Military, Environment *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 14 Jan* 77
- Military Units Damage Latvian Environment *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 14 Jan]* 78
- Latvian Draft Law on Ethnic Group Rights *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 6 Jan]* 81
- Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Completes Work 15 Feb 83
  - Pursuing Independence Course *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Feb]* 83
  - Supreme Soviet Issues Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 83
  - TASS Reviews Supreme Soviet Decisions 84
- Brazauskas Delivers Independence Day Speech *[Vilnius Radio]* 84

Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Member on Plenum Results *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Feb]* 86
Attempt To Smuggle 'CS' Gas Into Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* 86
Plans of Kishinev Anti-Russian Pogroms Rumored *[Moscow International]* 86
Weapons Sales, Pogroms in Moldavia Denied *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 1 Feb]* 87
Moldavian Party Reviews Events in Tiraspol *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 27 Jan]* 88
Moldavian Party on Disturbances in Capital *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 1 Feb]* 88
Moldavian Official on Gagauz Autonomy *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 1 Feb]* 89
Afanasyev Interviewed on Baltics, Gorbachev *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 18 Jan]* 90

Economic

Experts Discuss Development of Economic Reform *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 94
Academician Supports Draft Economic Platform *[IZVESTIYA 14 Feb]* 95
Government Reviews AUCCTU Price Appeal *[TRUD 10 Feb]* 97
Joint Venture Performance Assessed *[TRUD 8 Feb]* 98
Foreign Workers Complain of Food Shortage, Strike *[TRUD 13 Feb]* 100

Scientific

TASS Reports Experiments Aboard Mir Spacecraft 101
    Future Experiments 101
    Biological Experiments 101

Military

Yazov, Lizichev Attend Army Komsomol Plenum *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 102
Critics of Military Action in Azerbaijan Assailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Feb]* 102
Three Sverdlovsk Servicemen Refuse Baku Posting *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 102
Estonian Draftees Evade Military Service *[TASS]* 103
Reasons for Sinking of Nuclear Sub Debated 103
    Differing Views Defended *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Feb]* 103
    Letter From Crew Members *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Feb]* 107
Deputies Ban Health-Risk Military Facility *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 108

Further Reportage on Shevardnadze's Ottawa Visit

Visit Summarized

LD1502204890 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Ottawa February 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets:

USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze departed from Ottawa today. He was here on an official visit at the invitation of the Canadian Government and participated in the first round of the International Open Skies Conference which began in Ottawa on February 12.

Shevardnadze addressed the conference, spelling out the Soviet approach to the open skies concept.

He also had numerous meetings with foreign ministers of other countries, during which several important understandings were achieved.

These understandings concern agreement of the levels of Soviet and American armed forces in Europe, a summit meeting of the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and German reunification.

Interviewed on Talks

LD1502222490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1850 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, by correspondent V. Fotinov, after the Open Skies conference in Ottawa on 15 February—recorded]

[Text] [Fotinov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, what was the Ottawa conference all about? Was it about the Ottawa Open Skies initiative? Or was it a sort of continuation of the Soviet-American and Soviet-FRG talks held in Moscow on the eve of this meeting? Or was it to do with Vienna—bearing in mind the accords reached on conventional weapons?

[Shevardnadze] I believe that it was concerned with the issues in Ottawa itself as well as a continuation of the Moscow talks, and indeed the problems of the Vienna talks on conventional weapons, too. It was all three rolled into one.

[Fotinov] It was everything?

[Shevardnadze] It was everything—a complex. The main question, undoubtedly, as far as open skies are concerned, was connected with the conference, the main agenda of the conference. The idea itself is a very bold one, and interesting, and the fact that all the ministers took part in the conference and expressed their unanimous support, unambiguous support for this idea, this very fact seems very important to me, because it is indicative of a new stage, of new relations, of a new quality of trust between states. It is very important that this idea was supported—the idea itself. A document was agreed. All the main principles of this approach were reflected in this document.

As far as the technical aspects are concerned—quotas, and the rest, including equipment and instruments—these are difficult issues, but they can be resolved, they can. There are contradictions, there are different approaches concerning which planes and concerning the aircraft fleet, and so on, and the pilots, but this is all amenable to resolution. The most important thing, i would say, was to define one's position in principle. I believe that this really is a new stage in transparency [transparentnost], a new stage in confidence-building, a new stage in openness, [prozrachnost], as we say, and the fact that the conference so unanimously backed this idea...and the idea is not a new one, as you know, it is an old one....

[Fotinov] Thirty-five years.

[Shevardnadze] Yes, 35 years old. Now this idea has again been put forward by President Bush. It was well supported. We went further. You no doubt attended and noted that it was put on the agenda that, following the completion of our collective work to implement the idea, we should reflect on our future actions—also collective ones. Matters to do with open space, open land, open seas, open oceans, and so on, have been put on the agenda. In other words there is a lot of work to be done, very difficult work, fraught with contradictions, but the prospects that are opening up are indeed interesting and impressive.

[Fotinov] A question about the other decisions that have been taken here: the German question, the question of German unity and the machinery by which it can be achieved; and the question of reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe—what is the political potential of these two decisions that have been taken here?

[Shevardnadze] As far as the German question is concerned, I think that we, together with our partners, have now arrived at some very important decisions. I mean that we have found appropriate formulas—appropriate. We have hit on the appropriate machinery so that the process of rapprochement of the two German states, and all the difficult and complex phenomena associated with that process may be brought under control. In other words, the accord that has been achieved can be summed up by the formula: two plus four, that is, two German governments, the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic, and the four states, the Soviet Union, the United States, France and Britain—the Big Four, in other words. This mechanism will be set in motion. It seems to me that this is a very important decision. I do not know whether one can agree with some commentators who are virtually comparing this with the Potsdam agreements. Perhaps the comparison is not without foundation since this really is a new structure which is being created taking account of the changes which have taken place in Europe and in the two German states. So, this is also a very important agreement, an important accord. Its contents will be published in the press. It is very important that the four powers will participate particularly in resolving the external aspects of the drawing together of the two German states and it is very important that the text which has been agreed contains the idea of concern for the security of neighboring states.

By the way, this formula, this last formula was included at the request of Polish Foreign Minister Skubiszewski. So, we together with our friends and our allies, we all sat down and worked, so to say, with our partners, too, and this is the result of our collective work.

Concerning certain accords about the Vienna talks, I view what has been achieved here as a continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue in Moscow. You remember that the issue was discussed there about the numerical compositions of the Soviet and American troops in Europe, particularly central Europe. In Moscow our positions came closer, and here we agreed in principle completely. We agreed that the overall level of the Soviet-American presence in central Europe will comprise 195,000 men. Apart from this, the Americans assumed an obligation not to exceed a level of 30,000 for the remaining units in other states in Europe. We consulted with our allies and with the members of NATO on this issue, too, and such an accord, such a mutual understanding corresponds to common interests. In such a way, we untied a very complicated knot. Apart from settling other issues, which are already known, I think that a very important step has been made to prepare an agreement by the end of the year about reductions in conventional weapons in Europe, and thereby, a prospect is opening up for a conference, an all-Europe conference, at summit level.

That accord, by the way, has also been reached. We agreed together that such a conference will take place. So you see how all this is interconnected: Moscow, the Moscow talks with the secretary of state, and Mikhail Sergeyevich's meeting with the chancellor, and with Mr. Baker, and with Genscher, and the Ottawa conference on the open skies issue, the question of shaping a mechanism on the German question, the German problem, and the components of the talks in Vienna. So it's a rather complicated and interesting complex. To be frank, I am satisfied with the atmosphere and results of the talks.

Shevardnadze Attends Open Skies Conference

WA1402145190

For reportage on Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's attendance at the the Open Skies Conference in Ottawa, Canada, please see the International Affairs section of the 14 February West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Vorontsov Remarks on Israeli Settlement Policy

PM1402143390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA-TASS report under the rubric "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center": "Israel's Illegal Actions"]

[Excerpt] A press conference has been held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center by Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister. Its subject was "On Israel's Illegal Actions in Settling the Occupied Territories."

"Israel's action in settling the occupied territories with people who have never lived there," Yu.M. Vorontsov stressed, "is very serious and involves questions of security in the Near East. In this connection the Soviet representative at the UN Security Council has been instructed to raise before the Council the question of the urgent examination of Israel's illegal actions. The USSR hopes that discussion of this problem will be conducted with the seriousness it deserves."

The official Israeli explanation which we received in response to our request convinced us that this country's government is deliberately violating the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which forbids powers to settle occupied territories with persons who do not belong to the population of those territories. This document is signed by Israel. That country is also violating a number of resolutions which were adopted by the United Nations in the seventies and eighties and are directly aimed at the Israeli Government, requiring that it end this practice of settling the occupied territories.

In our view, under these conditions the UN Security Council should make a decision based on three elements. The first is to reaffirm that the Fourth Geneva Convention on the protection of the civilian population during the war that began 12 August 1949 still applies to the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem;

The second is to express the Security Council's disagreement with the Israeli Government's intention to settle immigrants on the occupied territories, which runs counter to the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention—specifically Article 49, which forbids the siting of a nonindigenous population on occupied territories;

The third is that the Security Council strongly appeal to the Israeli Government not to permit any action which could alter the demographic structure of the occupied territories. [passage omitted]

Further Reportage on Unification of GDR, FRG

Neighbors Fearful

PM1502113790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondents Ye. Bovkun, Ye. Grishin, and V. Lapskiy dispatch: "German Unity: Multitude of Opinions"]

[Text] Bonn—H. Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, has arrived in Bonn accompanied by 17 members of the government on a working visit which will not be excessively formal. It is expected that there will be an exchange of opinions with the FRG leadership on the fundamental issues of German-German rapprochement. Specific problems are being discussed at ministerial level.

Local observers are linking these talks—not without justification—to the results of the talks held by Kohl and Genscher in Moscow. On the whole, these have been positively assessed in Bonn: "The road to German unification is open."

That is probably true. But we would not want to oversimplify the problem. Yes, most citizens in the FRG and the GDR want to live under a common roof and consider unification to be a call of history. At the same time, there is great divergence of opinion about ways to bring about state unification. There are also opponents of a united Germany. A recent public opinion poll in the GDR showed that approximately one-fourth of the population does not want unification. There are fewer such people in the FRG, but they have to be taken into account.

No specific agreements on ways to bring about unification are expected. The federal government will clearly raise this question only after the March elections in the GDR.

It is thought that it will now mainly be a question of economic and financial problems and about an "emergency aid" program for the GDR. H. Kohl has officially proposed that H. Modrow set up a joint currency union.

It is planned to discuss the possibility of bringing the legal systems closer together. H. Kohl believes, however, that although the FRG's Basic Law is considered the "most successful constitution in German history," realities which will have to be taken into account have nonetheless emerged in the GDR over the past 40 years.

Some time ago H. Modrow, as is well known, put forward his concept of German unification. This process, in his opinion, should be in several stages, including the military neutralization of the two German states.

Bonn has welcomed the Modrow initiative on the whole, but the political status of a future unified Germany is seen differently here.

The multitude of opinions about the role of the FRG and GDR in building a peaceful European order are creating a situation in which there is a growing risk that decisions will be made which fail to fully take account of the entire range of other European countries' interests. That is why the fears with which Germany's neighbors are watching the process of German unification are understandable. They often see unification in the light of their own national problems.

The talks will clearly be difficult.

Obstacles Outlined

PM1502134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Feb 90 Second Edition pp 1,5

[Own correspondent S. Baygarov dispatch under the rubric "Abroad": "More and More New Problems... The Path to the Unification of the GDR and the FRG Cannot Be Easy"]

[Text] Berlin, 14 Feb—According to a sociological survey recently conducted by experts here, three-fourths of the GDR population is in favor of unification with the FRG. There is no doubt that the survey results have been affected by the fact that people are still flooding out of the country: An average of 2,500 people leave the GDR for the FRG every day. The FRG Government is in no hurry to abolish the privileges for these emigrants, despite the radical change in the GDR situation and its open borders.

At the same time, attempts are being made to undermine H. Modrow's government. Evidently there are forces in the GDR—but primarily in the FRG—which see the way to unification as lying not in the gradual drawing together of the two German states but in the sharp deterioration of the political and economic situation in the GDR, with the latter eventually being swallowed up, with no conditions whatever laid down, on the pretext of this being the only possible way to stabilize the situation in central Europe.

The basis of the plan "For Germany, a United Fatherland," put forward by H. Modrow, is that a final decision on the German question can only be taken in the conditions of free self-determination for Germans in both states, cooperation with the four victor powers, and consideration of the interests of all European countries.

The following idea has appeared in the Western mass media in connection with this plan and FRG Chancellor H. Kohl's recent visit to the Soviet Union: that Moscow has apparently given the "go ahead" and that now no one can stand in the way of a united Germany. Faint hints at this are also creeping into the GDR press. Evidently it is worth pointing out that the Soviet Union has never been against a united Germany in principle, and the authors of commentaries like these should cast their eye over modern history books, including Western publications, to see for themselves who was actually responsible for the division of Germany.

The general political background against which the process of the two states' unification must take place is highly important. This includes the questions of maintaining internal stability and strictly abiding by earlier treaties between the GDR and the FRG, which envisage, in particular, mutual noninterference in each other's internal affairs—a principle now being flagrantly violated by the West German political parties, which are waging an election battle on GDR territory as if it were their patrimonial estate.

Under the Modrow plan, the rights and interests of the four powers are preserved. But, at the same time, they must state their intention to settle all questions that have arisen as a result of World War II and the postwar period, including the presence of foreign troops on German soil and membership of military alliances, after the formation of a single German state. It also raises the question of concluding a peace treaty, which would finally remove from the agenda all problems connected with the aggression committed by Hitler's Germany.

It proposes to announce the military neutrality of the GDR and the FRG on the way to forming a federation. But this is precisely the point which arouses the greatest objections from H. Kohl, who has his own unification plan. Its essence is to incorporate the GDR into the FRG and thereby into NATO. This would mean that the sphere of influence of that military-political bloc would be extended further to the east, to the Oder-Neisse border. So far there have been no clear statements on the inviolability of postwar borders in Europe. Does this not reveal the far-reaching plans of certain circles, which are essentially questioning the decisions of the Potsdam conference on demilitarization, the formation of a neutral, democratic German state, and borders on the continent?

Meanwhile, speaking at a press conference in Bonn, H. Kohl never actually gave a clear answer to a question put to him about Poland's western borders, claiming that that problem could only be solved once and for all by "the government of the future united Germany."

The chancellor, who has announced that there is going to be monetary union between the two German states in the next few weeks, is eager to put his plan into effect. This is despite unanimous statements by Western and Eastern economic experts that this matter should not be hurried. They have pointed out, in particular, that it took eight whole years to prepare for Portugal and Spain to join the "Common Market." And in this particular case the situation is far more complex.

But there are other opinions in the FRG. Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, has proposed that there be a joint discussion of the problems of unifiying the two German states. In his opinion, the two German states must invite the four victor powers to discuss the question of how the process of German unification can be coordinated with the creation of a peaceful European order. Vogel believes that this question will be finally decided at the forthcoming all-European summit meeting, "Helsinki-2."

The Green party has also urged caution in the task of gradually bringing the two German states together. Its leadership has demanded that the FRG government "present a concept that will remove the fears of neighboring European states with regard to a future united Germany's possible desire for hegemony on the continent." In the opinion of the Greens, recognition of the final nature of postwar European borders and the demilitarization of the two Germanies is a particular requirement.

After the intoxicating feeling of virtually unlimited freedom, other moods have also recently appeared in the GDR. Many people are beginning to wonder what unification will actually give them and whether they will be able to preserve the free education, hot food in schools, inexpensive kindergartens and creches, shorter working day for women, children's allowances, and much more to which GDR citizens have become accustomed during the years of building socialism. It is extremely hard to marry all this with a market economy. Naturally, members of collective peasant farms are concerned by the question of what they will do if the former landowners make themselves known. After all, land in the GDR has not been nationalized. Similar problems are arising with enterprises and residential buildings. The country now has its own unemployed.

These processes will evidently intensify, because West German entrepreneurs are imposing very tough conditions on the formation of joint enterprises. A warning strike has already been held at one of these enterprises in Berlin. Economists have predicted that, if the Western mark is immediately brought into circulation, between half and two-thirds of all GDR enterprises will not be able to stand the competition and will fold. What is going to happen to their hundreds of thousands of workers?

In this connection, the GDR's Social Democrats have proposed drawing up a whole list of social problems that will need to be solved as a result of unification. Actually, why should this process be at the expense only of GDR citizens?

People are also apparently beginning to realize the danger of continuing the merciless struggle to completely eliminate the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, now the Party of Democratic Socialism. A political vacuum has formed at enterprises since that party withdrew: None of the country's parties fully accords with the interests of the working people. This situation is being exploited by extreme right-wing forces, which use any excuse to call for strikes, stoppages, and pickets and are trying to destabilize the situation. Having thrown themselves obliviously into the election battle, the country's old and new parties have handed over the squares to "ultras" of various hues. One gets the impression that it would only take one more action like the pogrom in the former central state security building for the situation to get out of the government's control.

The irreversible process of bringing the two German states together is raising considerable problems. Just how successfully they will be solved now depends on considered, careful actions and statements by figures in both West and East and on the successes of the policy of progressing along the path of good-neighborliness and mutual understanding throughout our continent. But at present it is hard to imagine a unified, prospering Germany in a divided Europe.

Compromise Required

LD1502222790 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 14 feb 90

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and France have agreed to hold talks with the participation of the two Germanies on international problems related to plans for the reunification of Germany. The talks are expected to start after the free general elections in the German Democratic Republic on the 18th March.

Two points should be singled out about German unity, writes our commentator, Aleksandr Pogodin. It is generally recognized that the issue must be tackled by the Germans themselves, who will determine the timetable, pace, and trend of their reunification. This is their sovereign right, but there is another highly important point, related to the fact that the German issue is not an isolated abstract one which affects no one but the Germans. The European nations remember only too well where the Second world War started, and so they are concerned about what effect the reunification of Germany might have on the European situation.

Currently, both in the West and the East people speak with satisfaction that European security is strong on the basis of stability and balance of strength. What will happen to this stability and balance after a reunited Germany appears? Inevitably, many political, economic, and military problems emerge. It is apparently necessary in this situation to have special responsibility and circumspection in decisionmaking. The process of the two Germanies getting closer to one another can proceed normally only provided the interests of the other European states are observed and the military and political equilibrium in Europe is maintained. It is highly disturbing in this connection that plans are made to have the united Germany within NATO. What will remain in this case of the current balance of strength? And what will happen if the new state, strong in every respect, decides to return to the problem of borders, which were established as a result of World War II?

There are many other questions. It is possible that at least some of them will be answered at the coming talks of the four powers that formed the anti-hitler coalition and the two Germanies. The discussion of problems should be rather complex, since there are rather different approaches to them. For this reason, it is necessary in particular, writes, Aleksandr Pogodin in conclusion, that all the sides display a sense of political realism and a readiness for compromise.

Modrow FRG Visit Deemed 'Favorable'

PM1602111590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 90 Morning Edition pp 1, 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents Ye. Bovkun, Ye. Grishin, and V. Lapskiy: "Each Has His Own Problems"]

[Text] Bonn—During the visit, in front of the headquarters of the Christian Democratic Union [CDU] in Bonn which had been temporarily transformed into a press center there appeared a poster depicting M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl talking to each other. The inscription reads: "Path to Germany's unity is open!"

The symbolism of unity, in this case appealing to the authority of the Soviet leader, is characteristic of the political atmosphere now reigning on the Rhine. Local politicians are expressing themselves in favor of accelerating the process of rapprochement between the FRG and the GDR while observing the interests of all sides involved.

But that is a good thing in theory, yet in real life it is difficult to reconcile viewpoints. As we have already reported, at the joint press conference on Tuesday the chancellor detailed his position on the question of the German-Polish border: The final decision on the border will be taken by a pan-German government. This statement of H. Kohl's gave new impetus to the debates on problems of security.

In a televised debate H.-J. Vogel, leader of the local social democrats, expressed regret that a real chance had been let slip for the leaders of the two German states simultaneously to declare their recognition of the border along the Oder and the Neisse. Let us recall that H. Modrow has made such a statement.

Vogel was supported by Ibrahim Boehme, leader of the Social Democrats from the GDR, who took part in the same debate.

Egon Bahr, an eminent SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] expert on disarmament, raised the question of the fate of the military alliances in Europe. He believes that after Germany's unification NATO and the Warsaw Pact, created on the soil of the German division, will lose any point. The enemy will disappear. Against whom should they be directed?

Bahr also expressed himself in favor of beginning talks on the FRG and GDR armed forces as soon as possible.

H. Modrow in turn welcomed, in unofficial talks, the proposal to hold a joint conference of foreign ministers of the four powers and of the two German states. This would help to link the interests of the four powers and their responsibility with pan-German responsibility for the process of European union.

The CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] is also prepared to share pan-German responsibility for the fate of the continent, but so far the FRG and GDR governments have no unified security concept.

Having reached agreement on the most important question—they must unite, and as soon as possible—the sides retained their former positions on several practical matters. We formed the impression that the members of the GDR delegation were disillusioned by the form in which Bonn clothed its promises to render economic aid: first elections to the People's Chamber and then radical financial support.

And so the GDR government delegation's visit to Bonn has ended. It is assessed in various ways here. The prevailing opinion is that it nonetheless proceeded successfully. The dialogue itself was unprecedented in nature.

The mass media highlight the agreement reached between H. Modrow and H. Kohl on forming a joint commission which will engage in creating a currency and economic union. It is true that its outline so far looks vague. The plan to create such a union is conceived as consisting of two parts. One day the Western Mark will replace the Eastern mark as the means of payment. At the same time the GDR must create the necessary legal conditions for transition to a market economy. Both parts, H. Kohl stressed, must be closely linked: The "dramatic situation" in the GDR requires immediate action.

Representatives of the business world with whom Modrow met on the last day of his visit expressed certain fears: that a currency union would generate such great hopes among Germans in the East and West that it could shake the FRG Mark. Industrialists expressed their readiness to implement specific projects but rejected "pure" financial aid. V. Reller [name as transliterated], president of the federal association of German banks, expressed himself in favor of the immediate institution of a currency union. In his opinion this would be a most important confidence-building measure. W. Mischnik, chairman of the Free Democrats' Bundestag faction, believes that economic aid is more effective and necessary for GDR inhabitants than financial aid. The social democrats criticize the concept of a currency union as a condition of the GDR's economic capitulation. The "Greens" denounce it as "extortion" by the federal government.

It has become definitively clear that the FRG will not now render the "emergency aid" sought by the participants in the Berlin "roundtable" and assessed at approximately 15 billion marks. Ibrahim Boehme, who was a member of the GDR delegation, frankly stated that he was disappointed in the chancellor: The federal government's measures to strengthen the GDR economy are inadequate. During his recent visit to the GDR H. Kohl had promised more generous aid.

At the talks between the GDR and FRG heads of government no agreement was reached either on the question of Germany's membership of military blocs after unification.

Nonetheless the results of the visit can be assessed as favorable for the further development of relations between the two German states. No one actually expected that the problems would be resolved rapidly and painlessly or that all the knots tied by previous German politicians since Ulbricht and Adenauer would be instantly untangled.

NATO's Woerner Meets Supreme Soviet Delegation

LD1502130190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2130 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] Brussels, 15 Feb (TASS)—NATO Secretary General M. Woerner met today with a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, headed by V.M. Falin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, and chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, in the Brussels NATO headquarters. The delegation arrived in Belgium at the invitation of the North Atlantic Assembly, which groups parliamentarians from 16 NATO member countries.

There was a detailed and open conversation, during which points of coincidence in the approach toward the military and political problems under discussion, connected with the chanegs taking place in Europe and with the prospects for the development of the processes of disarmament and strengthening trust, were noted.

Addressing journalists after the meeting, the head of the Soviet delegation expressed satisfaction with the exchange of views that had taken place. He emphasized that both sides had arrived at the conclusion that it is necessary to broaden dialogue which makes it possible not only to get to know each other better, but also to draw up ways to attain the goal that all countries of the East and the West are facing—the construction of a more stable, more secure, and more humane Europe.

World Peace Council Elects New Leadership

PM1502152990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Potapov dispatch: "Changes in the World Peace Council Leadership"]

[Text] Athens, 14 Feb—At a session of the WPC [World Peace Council] held in the Greek capital the movement's 40-strong collective leadership was elected according to the new charter. The new WPC president is Evangelos Makheras, an eminent Greek figure. He was born in Tripoli in 1918, was trained in law, and is honorary chairman of the Athens Bar Association.

Ray Stewart, spokesman for the New Zealand peace champions movement, was elected WPC executive secretary. Romesh Chandra became honorary chairman of the movement. He was granted powers to represent the WPC at the United Nations and at meetings with other international nongovernmental organizations.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Meets With Canadian Officials

Confers With Mulroney, Clark

LD1502115790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1029 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Ottawa, 15 Feb (TASS)—TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets reports: USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, who is conducting an official visit to Canada, was received by Prime Minister B. Mulroney on Wednesday. A free, thorough conversation on the key problems of world politics and Soviet-Canadian relations took place, which was characterized not so much by the two countries being party to different military-political blocs as by a consonance of assessments of the main issues of modern times.

The prime minister of Canada was handed a message from M.S. Gorbachev, and sincere greetings were conveyed from the Soviet leadership.

E.A. Shevardnadze stressed the historic importance for Soviet-Canadian relations of the prime minister's visit to Moscow in November 1989, and of the conversations that took place at that time with M.S. Gorbachev. This event marked the arrival of links between the USSR and Canada at a qualitatively new level, which opens up broad scope for their further progressive development.

The parties to the conversation spoke highly of the results of the "ministerial stage" of the international Open Skies Conference being held in Ottawa. E.A. Shevardnadze expressed gratitude to the Government of Canada for the creation of perfect conditions for its proceedings.

In light of the fundamentally important accord achieved on the previous day at a meeting of the foreign ministers of the GDR and the FRG with representatives of the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, and France, E.A. Shevardnadze and B. Mulroney discussed the external aspects of the German question, and tasks relating to the invigoration of the common European process in the present context.

E.A. Shevardnadze replied to questions from B. Mulroney, and told of the main elements of the draft CPSU platform for the 28th Party Congress, directed at the consistent advancement of the cause of perestroyka.

The prime minister noted the profound empathy of Canadians for the reforms being implemented in the Soviet Union, to which, however difficult the current period might be, there is no sensible alternative.

B. Mulroney confirmed the invitation to M.S. Gorbachev to come to Canada on an official visit.

E.A. Shevardnadze also held talks with the Canadian Foreign Minister J. Clark. In a discussion of international topics, there was an exchange of views on the mechanism for preparing the 1990 all-European summit conference, and about the proposed results of this forum in light of the dynamic political processes on the continent, and the noticeable progress toward the successful conclusion of the first stage of talks on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe.

It goes without saying that the German question did not fall from the ministers' view. Expounding the approaches of the USSR, E.A. Shevardnadze pointed out that it is impermissible to draw hasty conclusions. History has taught caution.

The discussion of regional problems was a detailed one: the situation in Central America, in Lebanon, in southern Africa, and the ending of bloodshed in Afghanistan. A significant similarity in appraisals and approaches was revealed. Among the important ones is confirmation by the sides of their willingness to recognize the results of the forthcoming elections in Nicaragua on the basis of conclusions by international observers.

The ministers analyzed the state of Soviet-Canadian relations, from cooperation between USSR union republics and the provinces of Canada, to curtailing the illegal trade in drugs. Specific new ideas for their further development were put forward. The partners in the conversation noted the need to devote special attention to cooperation between the USSR and Canada in the north, both in its bilateral and international aspect. It is no accident that the development of a reliable "Arctic roof" is viewed as an important element in the construction of the all-European home.

Moving on to disarmament topics, E.A. Shevardnadze reported on the progress which had been attained in the course of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue on limiting nuclear explosions and the elimination of chemical weapons. Here, tasks are reaching the agenda which require the application of energetic efforts by other countries too who are interested in ending the arms race.

The sides agreed to maintain close contact. E.A. Shevardnadze invited J. Clark to visit Moscow on an official visit. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

At the invitation of J. Clark, E.A. Shevardnadze paid a visit to a meeting of the parliamentary group of the ruling Progressive Conservative Party. The warm reception accorded the Soviet minister again testified to the fact that philosophical differences should not serve as a barrier to mutual understanding, without which one cannot regulate the pulse of the planet.

Further on 15 Feb Meeting

LD1502182790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 90

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The official visit of Comrade Shevardnadze to Canada is continuing. Our correspondent reports from Ottawa.

[Correspondent V. Fotinov] This is the Federal Parliament of Canada. [Video shows Canadian Parliament] Here, a meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze, the USSR foreign minister, and Prime Minister Brian Mulroney of Canada took place. Comrade Shevardnadze conveyed to the prime minister a personal message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. [video shows Shevardnadze and Mulroney standing together, being photographed and filmed by the media]

There was a conversation, during which questions concerning bilateral contacts and the further development of Soviet-Canadian cooperation were touched upon. This question by Soviet television was set to the Canadian prime minister: What is your assessment of the current state of Soviet-Canadian relations?

[Mulroney said] I think that they are developing very successfully. Mr. Shevardnadze and Mr. Gorbachev have made a very big contribution to acheive the level on which they now are. We are glad that today there is an opportunity to meet with Mr. Shevardnadze, and to discuss the future of those relations. [Video shows Mulroney talking to a correspondent]

After visiting Parliament, the USSR foreign minister conducted talks with Joe Clark, the Canadian foreign minister. [Video shows talks beginning between Soviet and Canadian delegations led by Shevardnadze and Clark; Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov is alongside Shevadnadze]. The sides noted that the potential for bilateral contacts is far from being exhausted by the agreements which were signed in November last year in Moscow. It is necessary to develop more vigorously trade and economic cooperation and to seek new forms of such cooperation.

[Announcer] At the invitation of Joseph Clark, Comrade Shevardnadze attended a sitting of the parliamentary group of the ruling Progressive Conservative Party.

Meets Canada's Governor General

LD1502185590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1751 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Ottawa, 15 Feb (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is here on an official visit, met today with Raymond Hnatyshin, Canada's governor general.

During the conversation, emphasis was placed on the existence of a solid foundation for the progressive development of Soviet-Canadian relations to the benefit of the peoples of both countries and of the entire international community. R. Hnatyshin showed great interest in the perestroyka processes taking place in the USSR, and he wished success in implementing the transformations being carried out in Soviet society. The government general represents Canada's head of state, who is formally the British queen.

Delivers Speech to Legislators

LD1502203190 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Ottawa February 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets:

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met with Canadian Governor-General Ramon Hnatyshyn here today.

It was stressed during the discussion that there existed a solid foundation for the development of Soviet-Canadian relations for the benefit of people of the two countries and the world community in general. The Canadian governor-general expressed a lively interest in Soviet perestroyka and wished success in implementing changes in Soviet society.

Shevardnadze made a speech today at a joint session of the Committee on Foreign Policy and International Trade of the House of Commons and the Foreign Policy Committee of the Senate. After the speech, which was heard with much interest, he answered numerous questions of Canadian legislators dealing with Soviet foreign policy, goals and prospects of perestroyka in the USSR, as well as prospects of the development of Soviet-Canadian relations.

Addresses German Unity Question

LD1602014590 Moscow TASS in English 0026 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Text] Ottawa February 16 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said that the USSR "clearly and without any reservations" welcomes democratic revolutions in Eastern Europe.

"We are marching in the same direction with our allies: We abandon impracticable and administrative models for organising social life," he noted.

Speaking on Thursday [15 February] at the joint sitting of the Foreign Policy Committees of the Canadian bicameral Parliament, Shevardnadze stressed the Soviet interest in the success of democratic changes in East European countries.

"I'd like to put it flatly: We do not try to put a brave face on a sorry business. Our national interest, our historic and even every-day interest lies in helping our neighbouring states be stable and prosperous. We shall only benefit by this."

The Soviet minister who was in Canada on an official visit, said further that the Soviet Union "has no political problems concerning the stay of our troops" abroad.

He noted that the USSR stated two years ago that the Soviet aim is to bring troops inside national borders.

Shevardnadze said that the only difficulty is "to have time for conducting conversion measures inside the country in order to provide housing and work to servicemen returning home."

Dealing with German reunification, the minister said that nobody doubts the right of Germans in the German Democratic Republic and West Germany to self-determination.

"But Germany's neighbours and European states also have the right to guarantees that a unified Germany, if it is established, will not be a threat, that it will not raise a question about remapping European borders and that Nazism and fascism will not revive."

Reminding the audience that the Second World War brought grief to hundreds of families, the minister said: "They do not cherish hatred or ill feelings towards the German people, but they have a right to warn politicians about their responsibility for the past and the future".

Shevardnadze noted that "the German question has emerged at a very complicated time. It has turned out that about a dozen European countries are simultaneously in a state of transition from one state into another.

"The Soviet Union and Germany are among them. Such a period entails great dangers even under the best circumstances." Therefore, the Soviet minister called for caution.

He warned against attempts of some politicians to play a political chess lightning tournament with a five-minute time-limit.

In minister's opinion, the German question taught another lesson: People should not put off the solution of questions related to war and peace for a later date. "If we had agreed and begun the implementation of a programme for dismantling the structure of military confrontation in Europe in due time, the problem of German unity would have needed quieter attitude and understanding."

Shevardnadze stressed that "The German question should be kept and discussed within the European process and should move in the direction, in which entire Europe is marching: Towards stronger security and development of cooperation."

Bush Cited on Baker Visit, Summit Prospects

PM1502103590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "G. Bush Press Conference"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Feb—Last week was "extremely important and positive with regard to East-West relations," U.S. President George Bush stated Monday opening a White House press conference almost entirely devoted to foreign policy questions.

He included among the main events of recent days the results of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, at which—as he put it—"progress was achieved in the Soviet political system's advance down the road of pluralism and genuine respect for Soviet voters' opinions." "I welcome this event, which shows yet again why our administration supports Mikhail Gorbachev's efforts aimed at expanding glasnost and perestroyka in the Soviet Union," Bush noted.

Assessing the Moscow talks between Secretary of State J. Baker and Soviet leaders, the head of the administration stressed: "Secretary of State Baker's visit to Moscow made it possible to achieve substantive progress on all points of the U.S.-Soviet agenda as regards preparations for the June summit in Washington. We achieved important progress in conventional arms control, strategic offensive weapons cuts, nuclear testing, and chemical weapons, and we also continued the search for ways to reduce our disagreements on regional problems, particularly as regards Central America and Afghanistan."

In Secretary of State Baker's talks in Moscow, the president went on, a great deal of what the Soviet leader and I planned when we outlined the aims of our meeting during our discussions in Malta was achieved. "I am convinced that if we continue to develop this progress in our bilateral relations with the Soviet Union, the June summit will be a great success."

President Bush was asked: How, following Secretary of State Baker's visit to Moscow, do you assess the likelihood that the three agreements—on chemical, strategic, and conventional arms—will be signed this year? "I am not sure that the three agreements will be ready for signing by the time the summit takes place, but I think that progress has been achieved in working out all three treaties. Our aim continues to be to reach agreement on conventional arms in Europe," Bush replied.

The president went on to stress that the United States adheres to its proposal to set a "ceiling" of 195,000 on Soviet and U.S. troops on foreign territory in central Europe. He reaffirmed that the United States wants to retain an additional 30,000 U.S. servicemen in a number of NATO countries outside central Europe. Bush claimed in justification of this position the fact that the United States and West Europe are "divided by a huge ocean."

The head of the administration stated that U.S. troops in West Germany are a "stabilizing factor." "All the European allies want us present on the continent, and we will stay there a long time yet, I hope, with a considerably reduced level of troops." Bush advocated keeping a reunited Germany in NATO, claiming that "nobody wants to threaten the Soviet Union."

Talking about FRG Chancellor H. Kohl's "successful" visit to Moscow, the president said that it "reflects the acceleration of the process of German self-determination. And the statements about German unity made by the Soviet side deserve our full approval. We support Chancellor Kohl's position that a reunified Germany should remain a NATO member."

During the press conference Bush called the release of African National Congress (ANC) leader Nelson Mandela "serious proof" of South Africa's progress toward a racially more equal society. However, he stated that it is still too soon to talk about lifting the economic sanctions imposed by the United States in 1986.

Delegation Visits U.S. Military Installations

Stops at South Dakota Base

LD1502002290 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] Washington February 14 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Mtyash:

Contacts between the United States and the Soviet Union in the military area are important for the consolidation of relations and confidence-building between the American and Soviet peoples, said General of the U.S. Air Force John Chain, who welcomed Soviet parliamentarians to Offut base on Tuesday.

The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defence and State Security, on a visit in the United States at the invitation of the U.S. Congress, is touring the country.

After visiting Colorado, Soviet parliamentarians arrived on Tuesday at a base of U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces in South Dakota and then visited Offut base, where the headquarters of the U.S. Strategic Aviation Command are situated.

The Soviet parliamentarians are accompanied by Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Head of the Soviet delegation, Vladimir Lapygin, a prominent Soviet rocketry designer, showed in his speech on specific examples that it is not at all the Soviet Union who set the initiative in the development of various systems of strategic offensive arms.

General of the Army Vitaliy Shabanov, USSR deputy defence minister, said it can be debated for long who has the initiative in the deployment of some or other weapon systems. But is is undoubted that the Soviet Union precisely declared that under no conditions it will start nuclear war. Deplorably, the United States has not made such a statement, he said.

Shabanov also mentioned U.S. missile-carrying Trident submarines, sea-launched cruise missiles deployed on submarines and surface ships of the U.S. navy, the very systems of arms that threaten strategic stability.

"The USSR and the USA should think of consistent reduction of nuclear arms, not of the arms race," Shabanov said.

Late Tuesday evening, the Soviet parliamentarians arrived in Killeen, Texas, where they will see military facilities.

Shabanov Comments on Exercises

LD1502132190 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Washington February 15 TASS—A delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defence and State Security visited a major U.S. land force base in Fort Hood, Texas, on Wednesday.

Participants observed exercises involving Vulcan anti-aircraft equipment and air-defence Stinger missiles and the AN-64 Apache fighter helicopters. The troops deployed on this base are frequently airlifted to Western Europe as part of NATO military exercises.

"I cannot say that we saw anything impressive," Soviet deputy defence minister on arms, General of the Army V. Shabanov said after the exercises. "But, it has become obvious for me that the U.S. Armed Forces are carefully working out all the details of an air-ground operation. First of all, this concerns the high degree of interaction of aviation, artillery and mechanised units. The high skills of troops were also impressive."

Soviet parliamentarians also saw the combat hardware of U.S. land forces. Americans also gave an opportunity to Colonel V. Ochirov to pilot the AN-64 Apache plane.

On the same day, the delegation visited the General Dynamics military plant that roduces the F-16 fighter-bombers.

The Soviet delegation is continuing its visit.

Alekseyev on U.S. Defense Department Guide

LD1502123390 Moscow World Service in English 0910 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Commentary by Spartak Alekseyev from the "News and Views" program]

[Text] According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the Defense Department of the United States foresees greater worldwide rivalry between the superpowers during the nineties. The prediction comes in a guide to defense planning for the forseeable future. Our commentary has been prepared by Spartak Alekseyev:

The guide is obviously intended to justify further action on big military programs. But since, as the computers say, the soviet threat in Europe has diminished, they must find another reason for continuing the arms race. So two goals are set: One is global confrontation with the Soviet Union in the Third World; the other, reassertion of the United States' superiority in multipurpose programmed sophisticated weapons. The new guide to planning also reaffirms such basic positions of the Pentagon as no new technology for the Soviet Union, defense of american interests in all parts of the world, and preparedness for global nuclear war with a view to winning the war.

When guides of this kind appeared at the height of the cold war, the tense international situation could justify them. But how can such planning be dovetailed with the destruction by both sides of entire classes of nuclear missiles or with talks to slash strategic arsenals by 50 per cent and reduce conventional arms and armed forces. How can there be action on projects for multipurpose and programed weapons to be used in space as well as elsewhere when an Open Skies agreement has just been reached on an international level. If new political thinking is the order of the day how can there be talk of heightened military rivalry?

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the Pentagon document reflects the opinion of President Bush that it is too early to plan comprehensive changes in strategy in response to the changes in the Soviet Union and its allies. True enough President Bush is showing caution that to our mind is hardly justified. But he has agreed with President Gorbachev on a whole program of bilateral contacts, negotiations, and joint actions with a new to doing away with the confrontation and developing both bilateral and global collaboration. In short, the leaders of the two superpowers are moving away from cold war political thinking and towards new thinking, suitable to a period of peace and recognition of their mutual and equal responsibility for the preservation of universal human values. At any rate, this is how the world saw the outcome of their meeting in Malta last December. The Pentagon is clearly demonstrating yesterday's thinking in planning a policy of modernized, sophisticated confrontation.

News Conference on Exchanging Cadets With U.S.

LD1402205290 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] West Point (New York State) February 14 TASS—By special TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev:

A news conference for American and foreign journalists was held by American and Soviet cadets in an assembly hall of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

A group of cadets from the Moscow High All-Arms Command School, named after the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, spent a week at West Point for the first time in the history of Soviet-American relations—as part of an exchange programme between the Soviet and American armed forces.

The exchange became possible because of changes in the international situation, owing to Soviet perestroyka, improved Soviet-American relations and the establishment of direct contacts between the armed forces of the two super powers, it was noted at the news conference.

The Soviet cadets' visit to West Point and the expected reciprocal visit by American military students to Moscow next month promote better mutual understanding between the Soviet and American peoples and help build up confidence between the Soviet and American armed forces.

As was expected, Soviet cadets were asked many questions. Each Soviet cadet answered in turn.

Journalists were interested in knowing the Soviet guests' opinion about the West Point training, their appraisal of the joint education of boys and girls at American military institutions, and plans of Soviet and American cadets to maintain friendly relations that were established at West Point this week.

"Contacts not only on a high level but also at the level of would-be officers will undoubtedly promote Soviet-American relations," Joel van Timmeren said on behalf of the American cadets.

"Having spent a week together, we have become convinced that both Soviet and American people desire peace and real international security," he said.

"The exceedingly warm reception accorded to the Soviet cadets both at West Point and other places we visited warrants the hope that Soviet-American relations will broaden and deepen and acquire new forms of cooperation," Lieutenant-Colonel Nilolay Voronov, head of the group of Soviet cadets, said.

Most of the souvenirs exchanged by Soviet and American cadets symbolise peace and friendship between nations.

"Exchanges between Soviet and American armed forces, including Soviet and American cadets, will undoubtedly promote comradely relations between the professional military men of the two countries," Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Bell, head of West Point Public Relations Department, told TASS.

Northeast Asia

MPR Head Quoted on Ties With USSR, China

OW1402103690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 9 Feb 90

[Text] Mongolia is developing good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union and China, said Sodnom, head of the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] Government. In an interview with the SANKEI SHIMBUN, Sodnom pointed out that Mongolia's plan to join the Nonaligned Movement will be a factor for peace in Asia. Speaking on domestic changes, he said he believed it is possible that the multiparty system will come into existence.

Mongolian Diplomat on Foreign Economic Ties

90UI0345A Moscow TRUD in Russian
6 Feb 90 p 3

[Interview with Zh. Enhsayhan, minister-counselor of Mongolian People's Republic Embassy in Moscow, by Ye. Zhurabayev; place, date not given: "With Mongolian Specifics"]

[Text] [Zhurabayev] What changes are being observed in Soviet-Mongolian relations?

[Enhsayhan] Mongolia treasures its friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, which have enabled it to score many successes in the development of its economy and a rise in the people's well-being. At the same time, there has been much posturing and show in our relations. Today these relations are becoming more businesslike and practical, and the parties are endeavoring to view all emerging problems on the basis of a balance of the interests of the two countries and their genuine equality.

During the meeting between our leaders, J. Batmonh and M.S. Gorbachev, in July 1989 particular attention was paid to questions of economic relations, primarily the principles of pricing and the balanced nature of trade. Understanding was reached on the need for an appreciable adjustment of the whole structure of cooperation.

It may be said that the spirit of openness and glasnost is becoming a characteristic feature of our mutual relations at all levels and in all spheres, which is objectively strengthening the foundations of real mutual understanding. An obvious step toward all-around study of the history of Mongolian-Soviet relations was the agreement by the two countries' foreign ministries to embark on joint work on the study of the pertinent archive materials stored in the USSR Foreign Ministry.

[Zhurabayev] What is your attitude toward the changes occurring currently in East Europe?

[Enhsayhan] I believe that these are an objective process brought about primarily by the domestic requirements of social development. This process has been greatly influenced by the changes occurring in the Soviet Union, as, equally, the general thaw in the international climate.

Perestroyka is occurring with us in Mongolia also. It is for this reason that the Mongolian people are adopting an understanding attitude toward the changes in East Europe and following them closely.

[Zhurabayev] What are the particular features of perestroyka in your country?

[Enhsayhan] The goal of the renewal and restructuring of Mongolian society was put forward in 1986 at our party's 19th congress. Reforms in our country began with the economy and following the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Fifth Plenum (December 1988) encompassed the political, spiritual, and other spheres of the life of society. Mongolian restructuring has not only aims in common but also certain features in common with the perestroyka being accomplished in your country and in the other socialist countries. It is for this reason that we are making a close study of foreign experience, using what really corresponds to our conditions and possibilities. We have also our own specifics, which are conditioned by the level of the country's development, geographic location, demographic singularities, and the distinctiveness of the path that has been taken. On account of these circumstances, the main emphasis in the economy is being put on the realization on a new basis of certain traditional forms of management, including the family contract, which has been applied and which has given a good account of itself for centuries. Particular attention is being paid to the construction of medium-sized and small businesses.

We are approaching from a new angle not only the contemporary history but also the ancient history of the country. New features have emerged in our foreign policy. Relations with our southern neighbor—China—have been completely normalized. Relations are expanding with Japan, the United States, India, and West European countries. In the foreign economic sphere, Mongolia intends joining more extensively in the international division of labor, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region.

[Zhurabayev] The 45th CEMA meeting was held recently in Sofia. How do you view its results?

[Enhsayhan] Topical problems of the development of the CEMA countries' economic cooperation were analyzed in Sofia. The processes occurring in these countries objectively require changes both in the forms and the content of this cooperation. Thus efficient methods of the material and financial support for the multilateral projects and programs which have been adopted and which are being developed have yet to be found. It is essential, in our view, to change the pricing procedure since the prices of the industrial-engineering commodities supplied to Mongolia are higher than world prices, and the prices of our export commodities are in many instances, on the contrary, lower. For this reason, Mongolia supported the decisions both on the expediency of a fundamental renewal of the activity and organizational structure of CEMA and the gradual transition to current world prices with payments in convertible currency.

U.S. Cuts in ROK Force Levels Welcomed

PM1402111790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 8 Feb 90 Single Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Observer's Column": "Is Ice Moving?"]

[Text] So it has been announced in Seoul that the United States, in the context of reducing its military presence abroad, will be closing three air bases in South Korea—in Suwon, Taegu, and Kwangju—by July 1992. Defense Minister Yi Sang-hun announced at a press conference that the U.S. Air Force subunits stationed at them would be redeployed to air bases in Osan and Kunsan, where the main force of the U.S. 8th Army is deployed.

Moreover, 2,000 service and maintenance personnel at the bases will be withdrawn from South Korea and 18 RF-4C reconnaissance aircraft will be transferred from Taegu to the Japanese island of Okinawa.

Yi Sang-hun was quick to emphasize, however, that "these measures will not upset the military balance on the Korean Peninsula." He pointed out that "the USAF combat potential in South Korea will actually be increased when an extra squadron of 24 F-16 fighter-bombers is transferred to the air base in Osan in July-September this year."

Moreover, one cannot help noticing that the Seoul administration itself is making vigorous efforts to increase the combat strength of its own air force. In 1993, it will start receiving the latest F-18A fighters, which have been chosen as the main combat aircraft. Nearly 150 will be acquired. Moreover, the South Korean Air Force, which currently has nine RF-4C tactical reconnaissance planes, will receive another nine, to compensate for the withdrawal of U.S. reconnaissance aircraft. Finally, the aforementioned three U.S. air bases, two of which—in Suwon and Kwangju—are already performing auxiliary functions, will be mothballed, so that in the event of an "emergency" the South Korean and U.S. Air Forces could use them for joint operations.

All this prompted the South Korean YONHAP agency to state that the "measures announced by Washington are intended to transfer some USAF functions to the South Korean armed forces while maintaining the military balance on the Korean Peninsula and, at the same time, to demonstrate a desire to reduce its own military presence in the Far East." And this accords with reality.

The definite steps by the Soviet Union to reduce its armed forces in this region and the DPRK's positive stance, geared to easing military confrontation on the Korean Peninsula, can no longer be rejected out of hand by Washington and Seoul. Thus, at the beginning of the year, a 10-percent reduction was announced in the scale of the annual U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit" maneuvers, which begin on 14 March. It has now been decided to close three U.S. air bases. And, as the well-known South Korean political scientist, Professor Kim Yu-nam, said, "Washington's latest decision should be followed by a reduction of U.S. ground forces in our country. The only question is whether it will be symbolic or substantial. This will become clear after the U.S. defense secretary visits Seoul at the end of the month."

The Seoul press reports that consultations on this question are currently taking place between between Washington and Seoul. But, obviously, if such a reduction does take place it will be purely symbolic. Because, the YONHAP agency reports, the Seoul administration may take a positive view of the partial withdrawal of U.S. forces, but only as long as it does not weaken the joint U.S.-South Korean defense potential. But this is far too vague, you will agree... . At the same time, there are many opponents of this idea in the United States itself. Only the other day, Admiral H. Mauz, commander of the U.S. 7th Fleet, urged abandonment of the plans for the reduction of the U.S. military presence in the Far East.

But one gets the definite impression that the "ice is moving," so to speak, in the southern part of the Korean Peninsula, albeit not on the scale that the advocates of easing tension would like. Nevertheless, a 10-percent reduction in the scale of this year's "Team Spirit" maneuvers, the closure of three U.S. air bases, and discussion of the question of a possible partial withdrawal of U.S. ground forces from South Korea are bound to generate optimism. The spirit of the new political thinking is breaking through in yet another part of the world.

Soviet-South Korean Symposium Opens in Moscow

*PM1402150790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Yevg. Bay report: "South Korean Businessmen and Parliamentarians in Moscow"]

[Text] A Soviet-South Korean scientific symposium entitled "Present-Day Situation in the Socialist Countries. Problems and Prospects for Soviet-Korean Relations" opened in Moscow 13 February. It is the first such bilateral meeting to be held in Moscow. Taking part in it along with representatives of major South Korean concerns such as Samsung, Hyundai, and others, are eminent politicians and deputies from the South Korean National Assembly. The South Korean delegation is headed by O Se-ung, parliamentary deputy and former South Korean first minister of state for political affairs.

The symposium is being staged by the USSR Academy of Sciences' Economics of the World Socialist System Institute together with the South Korean Institute of Parliamentary and Political Relations. At the same time, the scientific meeting was sponsored by Soviet cooperative organizations and mixed enterprises with an interest in developing trade and economic links with South Korea.

DPRK Disarmament Institute Head Visits Moscow

*PM1502095790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Feb 90 Morning Edition p4*

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation of the DPRK Foreign Ministry Peace and Disarmament Institute led by its director, Kho Seb [name as published], was in Moscow at the end of January-beginning of February at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Institute.

The delegation was received by I.A. Rogachev and V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign ministers. There was an in-depth exchange of opinions during their conversations on disarmament problems in the Asia-Pacific region. The two sides offered practical ideas on ways to ease military-political tension in this region.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Ryzhkov Wraps Up Visit to Australia 15 Feb

Gives SS-20 Fragment to Museum

PM1502145990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Stay in Canberra"]

[Text] Canberra, 14 Feb—N.I. Ryzhkov has had talks with W. Hayden, governor general of Australia.

W. Hayden hailed the first visit to Australia by a chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers in the history of Soviet-Australian relations, describing it as an important new step in the development of bilateral relations.

The Soviet leader and the governor general expressed satisfaction with the state of bilateral relations in various spheres and advocated their further ongoing development and their deepening on the basis of equality and mutual advantage.

N.I. Ryzhkov met with A. Peacock, leader of the opposition and leader of the Liberal Party of Australia. The talks, which were held in a constructive atmosphere, touched on Soviet-Australian relations and a number of international problems of interest to both sides.

The USSR head of government presented to the National Museum of Australia a fragment of a Soviet SS-20 intermediate-range missile destroyed in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The idea for the presentation had been advanced by K. Parker, secretary of the organization "People for Nuclear Disarmament," in a letter to M.S. Gorbachev. This organization is struggling to achieve universal disarmament and to arrange peaceful cooperation among peoples and advocates the elimination of military bases on foreign territories, including the U.S. bases on Australian soil.

The gift presented by N.I. Ryzhkov is to symbolize the international significance of peace initiatives.

Speaking at the presentation ceremony, K. Parker thanked the leader of the Soviet Government for the gift and voiced the hope that in the next few years the museum will be able to receive similar fragments of strategic missiles and sea-launched "cruise" missiles, which are to be eliminated in accordance with international agreements.

In a reply speech N.I. Ryzhkov supported the organization's desire to achieve the elimination of military bases on foreign territories and universal disarmament.

Attends Dinner Hosted by Hawke

PM1502152090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on 14 February Canberra dinner under general heading: "Stay in Canberra"]

[Excerpt] Today Australian Prime Minister R. Hawke gave a dinner in honor of N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is in the country on an official visit.

The dinner was attended by the officials accompanying the Soviet head of government on his trip, Australian ministers and members of Parliament, and public figures.

R. Hawke and N.I. Ryzhkov exchanged speeches at the dinner.

R. Hawke's Speech

Prime Minister Ryzhkov and Mrs. Ryzhkov!

Colleagues and members of Parliament!

Ladies and gentlemen!

On behalf of the Australian Government and the Australian people allow me, Mr. Prime Minister, to express our satisfaction at the fact that you have come on a visit to Australia at this time, a time of historic importance both for your country and for the whole world. This is a great honor for us.

In recent years relations between our two countries have developed at a tremendous pace and in a direction that can only be beneficial to the Australian and Soviet peoples.

Mr. Prime Minister, your visit will further strengthen these ties. Allow me to assure you that you and Mrs. Ryzhkova are welcome guests in Canberra and in Australia.

I hope that our warm welcome and also the constructive and frank dialogue we have had with you have shown you what great significance Australians attach to the changes you are carrying out in the Soviet Union, and how positively we react to them.

The Australian Government is prepared to develop and widen relations between our countries—the private sector of the Australian economy seeks to strengthen trading links, while the Australian people actively want to build the foundations of friendship.

It gives me pleasure to recall the fruitful discussions held in Canberra in 1987 between myself and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, and later—in Moscow—with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, yourself, and your colleagues. These discussions generated confidence and a real, personal trust between us.

During our conversations in Moscow we discussed your programs of perestroyka and glasnost and the progress, welcomed by everyone, on the arms control question, the lessening of tension in various regions of the world, and the creation of favorable economic conditions, as well as the steady improvement in affairs in the human rights sphere in the Soviet Union.

Then, in 1987, your country had, it appeared, already undergone major changes with regard to both domestic and foreign policy.

How modest that assessment appears now that we meet again, only two years later!

The pace of reform both in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe is, in a word, staggering. You have not only changed the face of your part of the world, but radically transformed the very structure of the world order that had become established since the end of World War II.

We have witnessed the breaking down of the wall between the FRG and the GDR—a wall that for a long time symbolized the division of Europe. We have witnessed how the desire for democratization in Eastern Europe was satisfied, and, with the tragic exception of Romania, satisfied by peaceful means. We have witnessed how in the GDR, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia the communist parties have agreed to participate in multiparty elections to newly created parliaments.

We have also witnessed how wisely and correctly the Soviet leadership has reacted to these dramatic changes.

We recently announced a number of diplomatic, financial, and other measures formulated to help the East European countries to develop new, democratic systems: These measures are our practical response, a considered and pondered response that goes hand in hand with a sense of joy in our hearts that we feel on learning of the strengthening of political and economic freedom in those countries to whose peoples it was for a long time denied.

In the Soviet Union itself, only last week a historically important decision was adopted on creating the conditions for the holding of free, contested elections, and consequently for the development of a more open society.

I will never forget how, on the last day of my visit to Moscow, I heard reports that a number of cases of "refuseniks" which I had raised with the Soviet Government had been settled rapidly and sympathetically. It gives me enormous personal satisfaction that the Soviet Union's positive reaction on human rights questions is continuing and that, in particular, our two countries are engaged in such a close and constructive dialogue on this problem.

The agreement on interpersonal contacts and cooperation in the humanitarian sphere which we are to sign tomorrow will represent the successful outcome of our talks, which began at a time when such questions were comparatively rarely discussed between the Soviet Union and the West.

Mr. Prime Minister, at the dinner you held in my honor in Moscow I noted that in the last 40 years the world had slowly but surely built itself a nuclear gallows. I said that if for some reason mankind came to mount that scaffold and look into the eyes of the executioner, we would see ourselves.

The task facing us was to dismantle the gallows, and to dismantle it in such a way that our own security would not suffer in the process.

Mr. Prime Minister, it is with a sense of profound admiration and respect that we offer our congratulations on the work your government has done, together with the United States, on this exceptionally important question.

Today we are indeed living in a more secure world. The gallows have not by any means been dismantled, but there is now more confidence that it will not be used.

So the structure of the world order has really changed.

Mr. Prime Minister, we do not and should not feel a sense of superiority as we welcome the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. No country in the history of the world has made the transition to the creation of democratic institutions and processes without trauma to society. As you know, in talks with you we have persistently and unswervingly stressed the importance of creating those institutions and pointed to the need to do this if we want the people's legitimate aspirations to be satisfied. The fact that these processes are in full swing gives us enormous joy, and we intend without fail to be with you during the development of these processes.

Today I wish to tell you frankly that the Australian Government welcomes and supports the economic and political changes taking place in the Soviet Union—changes that have played such an important part in this transformation.

We admire the courage and breadth of vision displayed by the Soviet leadership in implementing these reforms.

We would like you and your country to achieve success in your efforts to maintain the pace and of these reforms and keep them on course.

Your successful creation of a more open and peaceful society and the incorporation of your economy into the world economy will benefit us too.

The lessening of tension in relations between the superpowers and the implementation of a constructive Soviet foreign policy will lead to greater stability throughout the world, and in particular in our region.

The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, your creative, positive contribution to the cause of resolving long-standing problems in Namibia, your role on the Cambodia question, including your support for Australia's proposal on involving the United Nations in the resolution of the tragic conflict taking place there, and the reduction in the numbers of your troops located on the Soviet-Chinese border and in Cam Ranh Bay—all these steps are wholeheartedly welcomed.

The emergence of a more favorable and stable situation in the world has also had a positive influence on the authorities in the Republic of South Africa, as is indicated by the release, at last, of Nelson Mandela.

In the same way, when you achieve success on the question of arms control and disarmament, we too achieve progress on the way to the resolution of other tasks we regard as important—such as the elimination of chemical weapons. We were very grateful for your support for the international conference of representatives of governments and industry against chemical weapons held in Canberra last year.

It is also important to note that success in your work to create an open Soviet economy and make it more efficient is bound to benefit both sides.

We are interested in studying any opportunities that now exist or that could arise in future for the peaceful development of trade ties between our countries.

Today we discussed a number of questions concerning spheres in which Australia, with its strong agricultural and material base and efficient transport and communications infrastructure, could share its experience and knowledge with you.

One specific sphere which I also mentioned in my conversation with President Gorbachev is our achievements in the processing and storage of food and its transportation over long distances—a sphere in which improvements will directly benefit producers and consumers of agricultural produce in the Soviet Union.

I am also pleased that tomorrow we will sign both a fishing agreement and a trade agreement—both built on businesslike foundations and representing a substantial long-term mutually beneficial expansion of our trade ties.

There are a great many other opportunities for establishing economic and trade ties between our two countries, in particular through the creation of joint enterprises. In Melbourne yesterday you were briefed on one of these joint enterprises: a very promising proposal on aluminum, involving the "Comalco" firm and the USSR Ministry of Metallurgy.

Australia could also help to implement President Gorbachev's plans for the accelerated development of the Soviet Far East. A number of Australian firms will be participating in a major trade exhibition in Vladivostok in July in order to draw attention to the enormous benefits that could be offered by Australian firms offering their goods and services in that region.

Mr. Prime Minister, the conclusion of agreements on environmental conservation and on measures to prevent radioactive contamination will open up the way to further constructive cooperation between us.

I was very pleased by President Gorbachev's recent message to the global forum on environmental conservation and development for survival, particularly his specific mention of the Antarctic.

Australia vigorously advocated the banning of the exploitation of mineral resources in Antarctica and the conservation of this splendid, wild continent as a continent of science and a nature reserve. I am gratified by your words today to the effect that the Soviet Union shares our concern about environmental conservation in this region.

Mr. Prime Minister!

In 1987, on the way to Leningrad and Moscow, I stopped over in Singapore, where I was invited to deliver the annual "Singapore Lecture." In my speech I spoke of the events that have occurred in that most dynamic region—the Asian and Pacific region, also mentioning the new diplomacy being pursued in the region by the Soviet Union.

I said that Australia will welcome the USSR's constructive participation in political and economic events in the region.

I would like to note that on my return home this statement was criticized in some circles, where it was seen as too optimistic in its interpretation of the Soviet Union's intentions.

Of course, today not only have my words been vindicated by subsequent events, but you could say that these events have almost overtaken us.

It has once again become clear that the Soviet Union's energetic, creative implementation of its policy has more than justified, and has sometimes surpassed, the expectations even of those of us in the West who perceived the scope of your planned reforms at an early stage. At the same time the prejudices of those who insisted on assessing the USSR by the yardsticks of the fifties, sixties, and seventies have been totally shattered.

A few years ago a visit to Australia by a Soviet prime minister would have been an unlikely event. And, of course, it would not have taken place in the constructive spirit and with the frankness and warmth that characterize your visit.

In the nineties Australia and the Soviet Union will be able to benefit greatly from contacts of this kind. We have to study a great many opportunities for consultations and cooperation.

I hope you will tell President Gorbachev about the Australian people's aspirations and about our feeling of admiration and respect for him, for you, and for your colleagues, prompted by what has already been achieved as well as what you seek to achieve.

I also hope, Mr. Prime Minister, that this, and everything you have seen during your visit, will give you new strength. We, for our part, are profoundly inspired by the prospects for the future that open up with your arrival.

Our times are times of unprecedented opportunities, when farsighted leaders are really making the world a better place.

That is the main reason why we support you and wish you success in implementing your plans. [passage omitted]

Delivers Canberra Dinner Speech

PM1502122790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at 14 February dinner in Canberra, Australia under the general heading: "Stay in Canberra"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Hawke!

Ladies and Gentlemen!

Comrades!

I thank the Australian Government and Mr. Hawke personally for the invitation to visit your country and, in particular, for their magnanimous understanding of the circumstances which obliged me to postpone this visit for 18 months. I believe that this demonstrated the respectful, friendly attitude of Australians toward our country, which is now going through a crucial stage in its historical development. We hope that the talks and meetings with your country's statesmen and representatives of business circles will also be useful to the cause of perestroyka.

Soviet people see Australia as a country enveloped by the restless pioneering and innovative spirit. Although the Russian seafarers Krusenstern, Bellingshausen, Lazarev, and others reached Oceania after Tasman and Cook, they made significant geographic discoveries here which filled the annals of research into this part of the world ocean.

The Australian people's achievements in opening up the "fifth continent" and developing the country's economy and its productive agriculture are well known in the Soviet Union. We know and value the creativity of many outstanding representatives of Australia's culture.

Our relations are of a multifaceted and, it may now be said, a stable nature. Preconditions are also being created for the more active development of mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation.

And yet in a certain sense we are, as it were, rediscovering for ourselves such a promising partner as modern Australia in the Asia-Pacific region and in world politics and economics.

On the part of your country, as far as I can judge, there is also growing interest in the Soviet Union and in the fundamental transformations taking place there, which we call perestroyka.

We are really going through truly revolutionary changes now, which have embraced politics, the economy, spiritual life, and people's very awareness. Having revised many stereotypes of the past, but remaining true to the social choice made by our people seven decades ago, we have embarked on a path of building a democratic, rule-of-law state, profoundly reforming the institutions of power, and creating a self-managing socialist society.

Paramount attention is being devoted to overcoming the complexities that have arisen in the Soviet economy. This is the aim of the Soviet Government's program of phased economic measures, which includes both emergency measures to stabilize the economy in 1990-1992, and a strategic shift in 1992-1995 toward a new economic model founded on diverse forms of ownership, the principles of a regulated market, free choice of economic partners, and a flexible price formation mechanism.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum held at the beginning of February gave a strong boost to the perestroyka processes in our country. It adopted the draft Central Committee platform for the party's upcoming congress, which provides clear political guidelines and serves to rally all healthy forces in Soviet society around the goals of the revolutionary transformations. The chief point is that the resolution of our immediate and strategic tasks is clearly conceived by way of renewing society and the party.

Of course, fundamental reforms in a country such as the Soviet Union could not fail to affect the whole package of modern international relations. The new political thinking which has firmly entered the USSR's relations with the international community has accelerated the course of world events, helping to end the "cold war" and contributed to the world's transition to a new epoch of universal detente, peaceful coexistence, and cooperation.

We are witnessing major steps by East and West toward each other and their joint progress toward a new, more secure and democratic world.

The entry into force of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles began the process of nuclear disarmament. Next in line is the conclusion of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on a 50-percent cut in strategic and offensive arms. The question of concluding an agreement to limit conventional arms and armed forces in Europe in Vienna in the very near future is arising on a practical plane. The elaboration of a convention banning chemical weapons is at the final stage.

The Soviet Union seeks to promote such development in every possible way: We are cutting our Armed Forces and military appropriations and implementing a program to convert military production to civilian needs.

Alongside disarmament, the settling of regional conflicts, and other aspects of all-embracing international security, supranational problems, including ecological problems demanding urgent collective action, are facing mankind in all their magnitude. Profound concern for our planet's ecological future was heard at the recent Moscow global forum on environmental protection and development for survival. At the forum the Soviet Union advanced a number of new initiatives, notably with regard to elaborating an international-law regime for the protection of unique natural zones of worldwide significance. This applies primarily to the Antarctic. We are ready to cooperate with other countries, including Australia, in realizing these initiatives, including the survival of the Antarctic—a world reserve and our common natural laboratory.

Being here on the Australian continent, which is firmly linked with the Asia-Pacific region's destiny by bonds of geography, politics, and time, I would naturally like to speak about our vision of the situation in this part of the globe.

Many people predict a great future for it and a period of flowering in the 21st century. Time will show how right the futurologists are.

Today the Asia-Pacific region is at a crossroads, as it were. An improvement in the general political atmosphere has become apparent here; ways to settle regional conflicts have been delineated; and the culture of bilateral relations is improving. The majority of countries in the region clearly display a desire to try to ensure their own security not by military but by political means.

At the same time it cannot fail to be seen that the situation remains far from simple. The military confrontation level here is still high. Some countries are still involved in the costly and dangerous process of arming themselves. Not all opportunities are being utilized to organize all-regional cooperation on an equitable basis, without any discrimination.

This is why in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk the Soviet Union appealed to all countries in the Asia-Pacific region to jointly seek ways for the constructive restructuring of regional relations and the strengthening of peace, security, and cooperation.

Proposals to ease military tension in the region are at the core of our initiatives. And this is not just a declaration but a consistent, real policy reinforced by weighty practical measures, including unilateral measures, to reduce the military danger. We expect the main military powers in the region to respond in similar fashion to the Soviet Union's steps.

Mutual trust and security are opening doors for broader trade and economic cooperation. The Soviet Union seeks to raise its ties with Pacific states to a new level—on both a bilateral and multilateral basis—and to assimilate new forms of maintaining them. I believe that the Soviet Union's broader involvement in the regional forums' work would be mutually useful—both for us and for other Asia-Pacific states—particularly if we do not stop at the present day but look forward.

Mr. Prime Minister!

We regard the expansion of cooperation with Australia as an important area of Soviet policy in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world arena as a whole. Can we say today that we have grounds for being satisfied with the way Soviet-Australian relations have developed in recent years? I believe that this question should be answered in the affirmative.

The political dialogue, including dialogue at a high level, is being deepened and put on a regular footing. Your visit to our country at the end of 1987, Mr. Prime Minister, played an important role in activating this dialogue.

Our countries' collaboration in the international arena is being strengthened. The coincidence or closeness of the USSR and Australia's positions on such important questions of disarmament as the ending of nuclear tests, the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the nonmilitarization of space, and the banning and destruction of chemical arsenals is a sound basis for this. We are also impressed by your government's unbiased, innovative approach to settling the Cambodian conflict—the most acute problem in the Asia-Pacific region today.

We see good prospects for developing and deepening bilateral cooperation in many spheres. This is also confirmed by the fact that a number of Soviet-Australian agreements are to be signed during our visit: on cooperation in the spheres of fishing, trade, environmental protection, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy and in the humanitarian sphere, as well as a consular treaty. This is a weighty addition to the accords on cooperation in various spheres that have been reached over the past three years.

At the same time, we see that very great potential has been laid down in Soviet-Australian relations, which still has to be fully revealed and set in motion. We are ready to work actively in this direction, being firmly convinced that the expansion of mutually advantageous cooperation will accord with the interests of our countries' peoples and make a contribution to the general improvement of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Permit me in conclusion to wish you, Mr. Prime Minister, Mrs. Hawke, and everyone present in this hall well-being and success, and the entire Australian people peace and prosperity.

Thank you for your attention.

Concludes Talks With Hawke

LD1502121790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 15 Feb 90

[By TASS special correspondents Aleksey Voronin and Vadim Talanov]

[Text] Canberra, 15 Feb (TASS)—Talks ended here today between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is on an official visit to Australia, and R. Hawke, Australian prime minister.

At the final meeting, with the participation of those accompanying the Soviet head of government and the corresponding Australian representatives, the focus was on various aspects of Soviet economic reform and the opportunities for further expansion of Soviet-Australian trade and economic links which are opening in light of this. Issues of conversion, the convertibility of the ruble, and the establishment of special economic zones in the Soviet Union, were touched upon.

Common understanding was reached on the need for mutual efforts to achieve greater balance in bilateral trade, including through Soviet machinery and equipment exports to Australia. On the Australian side, great interest was displayed in establishing trading and economic contacts with the Soviet Far East, something which, in the opinion of the participants in the talks, will be facilitated to a significant degree by the 1990 major Australian trade and industry exhibition in Vladivostok.

The state and prospects of bilateral exchanges in scientific-technical, cultural, humanitarian, and other areas were discussed. The opinion was expressed that the peoples of our countries should get to know each other better.

On his impressions of his stay in Australia, N.I. Ryzhkov noted in particular the benevolent atmosphere in which his visit had passed. He stressed: We see it as a manifestation of the sentiments of sympathy and friendship whiuch are held toward our country and the Soviet people in Australia.

Both sides expressed satisfaction at the talks which took place in a businesslike and cordial manner, and they expressed the hope that the visit would provide a considerable stimulus to galvanizing bilateral relations in various spheres.

N.I Ryzhkov conveyed an invitation to R. Hawke to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. His invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Further on Hawke Discussions

PM1502132990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Stay in Canberra"]

[Text] Canberra, 14 Feb—Talks began today between [USSR Council of Ministers Chairman] N.I. Ryzhkov and [Australian Prime Minister] R. Hawke. They had a long one-on-one conversation, during which the heads of government thoroughly discussed various aspects of bilateral relations, devoting special attention to the prospects for their further development, and examined a number of questions of contemporary international life.

Both sides voiced satisfaction with the fact that relations between the USSR and Australia are increasingly being filled with weighty, specific substance. The Soviet-Australian political dialogue is developing successfully, bilateral contacts are being activated in various areas, the mechanism of political consultations is working, and ties along parliamentary lines and between representatives of the public are expanding.

Questions concerning trade and economic cooperation between the two countries were subjected to in-depth examination. It was emphasized that bilateral economic ties have considerable potential for further growth. The sides came out in favor of a joint search for new, progressive forms of cooperation in this sphere, notably through arranging direct collaboration and creating joint ventures.

At the request of the Australian prime minister, N.I. Ryzhkov provided a detailed characterization of the contemporary stage in the development of Soviet society, describing the profound transformations occurring in all spheres of life in the Soviet Union—the radical economic and political reform, the democratization of the country's social life, and the development of a new federalism.

R. Hawke wished the policy of perestroyka success and expressed confidence that its consistent implementation will promote the further growth of mutual understanding and trust among the peoples and help to strengthen the cause of peace and international security.

The sides noted with satisfaction that the development of the situation around the world is now characterized by a number of positive changes and by the desire of states to reach agreement on complex political questions and to seek and find solutions to tangled knots of tension.

The prime minister confirmed the Australians' profound interest in the initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union aimed at reducing military confrontation and strengthening security in the Asia-Pacific region and at developing international cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region on a bilateral and a multilateral basis.

N.I. Ryzhkov expressed a positive attitude to Australia's stand on a number of disarmament problems, including a ban on nuclear tests and chemical weapons and the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. The statement of support by Australia for the Soviet Union's intention to involve itself in the work of regional economic structures was welcomed.

Both sides emphasized the need for the speediest settlement of conflict situations in various parts of the world in accordance with the universally recognized norms of international law. In this context the Soviet side made a positive assessment of Australia's efforts to find ways to achieve a Cambodian settlement.

The exchange of opinions revealed the two countries' growing mutual understanding on a number of cardinal problems of world politics and their readiness to expand cooperation and to take concerted parallel steps with a view to strengthening international security.

Reviews Soviet-Australian Ties

LD1502162190 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Canberra February 15 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Alexey Voronin and Vadim Talanov:

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov expressed satisfaction with the results of his official visit to Australia. The visit gave a fresh impetus to economic relations and cooperation in the foreign policy activity between the Soviet Union and Australia, Ryzhkov told a news conference here today.

Noting that this is the first visit to Australia by a Soviet prime minister after the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries in 1942. Ryzhkov emphasised that many economic questions have been discussed during the visit.

"We have realised that Australian businessmen are much interested in cooperation with the Soviet Union," he said. "There is now more confidence in relations between the two countries. This is a good basis for relations, guaranteeing their further development."

The Australian side supports the transformations under way in the Soviet Union, the Soviet prime minister said with regard to the past negotiations. He said that matters of the economy and foreign policy were also discussed.

Ryzhkov said the situation in the Asia-Pacific region was discussed with the emphasis on the need to resolve the Cambodian conflict. The Soviet side once again expressed satisfaction and support for the proposals made by the Australian side for the solution of the Cambodian conflict with the United Nations participation, Ryzhkov said.

Other questions of the international situation, specifically processes in Eastern Europe and Soviet-American relations were also discussed, Ryzhkov noted.

"We have come to realise that the Australian leadership, the prime minister, the foreign minister and their colleagues approve of the Soviet initiatives and proposals in world politics and the steps the Soviet Union intends to take," he added.

The head of the Soviet Government noted the constructive character of conversations and meetings he had in Australia. He said that they were embued with benevolence and respectful attitude to the Soviet Union.

"We feel that the Australian people has a very positive attitude to the Soviet Union," he said.

Answering questions from journalists, Ryzhkov said that the Soviet Union is now at a very complex, crucial stage, when the old system is being eliminated, and a new system—in the economic and political area—is just emerging.

"We believe in perestroika and are of the opinion that we are on the right road," he said. "We shall continue on this road."

Ryzhkov also expressed the confidence that inter-ethnic conflicts in the Soviet Union will not be an obstacle to the development of Soviet Union's business relations with foreign partners. he reminded of his invitation to Australian businessmen for cooperation, first of all in the Soviet Far East.

TASS Reports News Conference

LD1602005690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 15 Feb 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Canberra 15 Feb (TASS)—N.I. Ryzhkov met journalists covering his tour of Australia.

In his introductory remarks he said:

I would like to sum up the results of the visit very briefly. This the first visit by a head of government of the Soviet Union since diplomatic relations were established in 1942. It is in return for Prime Minister R. Hawke's visit to Moscow in December 1987. He invited the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to visit Australia. Circumstances, however, prevented me from doing so for a year and a half. The time has now come to take up the invitation.

Speaking of this visit as a whole, I want to say first that we are satisfied with it. We have been able to discuss many economic issues and we have felt that your businessmen are very interested in cooperating with the Soviet Union. This is the result of the great trust that has developed in recent years, especially since the visit of the Australian prime minister. Our relations have come to be characterized by greater confidence. This is a good basis, and provides guarantees for the future development of our relations.

The first thing we discussed was external economic matters. We mapped out a number of interesting projects, which we will have to work on.

The Australian side took a very serious interest in the internal situation in the USSR in the economic and political spheres, and in interethnic relations. We gave exhaustive answers and described everything being done in our country and the outlook for our future development.

We received support for perestroyka during the bilateral talks and in one-to-one conversation with R. Hawke. The Australian side supports the reforms that are taking place in the Soviet Union. That was the second part of our talks.

The third part concerned foreign policy problems. The conversations covered a pretty broad spectrum. This applied above all, of course, to the Asia and Pacific region, with emphasis on trying to solve the conflict in Cambodia. We exchanged views on this issue and once again expressed satisfaction with, and support of, the proposals made by the Australian side for involving the United Nations in resolving the conflict in Cambodia. We also touched on our matters, in particular on the processes that are happening in Eastern Europe, and also Soviet-U.S. relations.

We understood that the leadership of the country, the prime minister, the foreign minister, and their colleagues approve of the initiatives and proposals and the changes in world politics which the Soviet Union is pursuing and will pursue in the future.

All our conversations and all our meetings have been constructive and imbued with benevolence and respect for our country. We feel that the people of Australia are very positive in their attitude to the Soviet Union. We met here as friends, and part still more confident that our relations will develop.

I said at a brief talk with journalists yesterday that by making this trip I did not just want to carry out the formal duty of paying a return visit to Australia. But I also wanted this visit to lay a further foundation and give a new boost to our economic relations and cooperation in our foreign-political activities.

N.I. Ryzhkov answered the questions of journalists.

Q: What can you say about the future of the perestroyka process in the Soviet Union?

A: We started this process not just for the sake of doing something and then calling it perestroyka. The thing is that our society has ripened for those changes that are taking place. Only later all that was given the common name of perestroyka. It was no longer possible not to implement reforms in our country. We could have ended up much worse, as we can see now from the experience of Eastern Europe.

At present we are at a very complex, I would say, crucial stage, when an old system is being eliminated and a new one is just being born. This applies to the sphere of the economy, as well as to the sphere of politics. That is why we have such a difficult time now, but we have faith in perestroyka and those principles that we have enshrined in it. If we had not believed in them, then we would not have been working and implementing a new policy. Yes, we must live through this difficult time. Tell me, what radical changes in any country took place in a calm atmosphere? Nothing like that has happened or will ever happen. That is why we believe that we are on the right path and we will continue moving in this direction.

Q: You have invited Australian businessmen to invest resources in the Soviet economy. Australian capitalists, like all the others, would like to be sure that the events in Azerbaijan, Armenia, and certain other republics will not hamper this. Can you assure Australian businessmen that the Soviet Union will guarantee stability for business cooperation?

A: I was asked a similar question by Australian television representatives as I was flying out of Moscow. I gave them an answer, and I now hold to that point of view: If businessmen—and as a rule, they are very clever politicians—consider our undertaking to be a promising one, they will invest money and cooperate. And those temporary difficulties that exist in the Soviet Union will not hinder them.

We have very clear-cut legislation, and this, incidentally, is something we must subsequently draw up with the Australian side—on protection of capital investment. After all, it is much easier for businessmen to deal with us, since in the end the state acts as a guarantor. Whatever might happen, the state is obliged to compensate everything. Perestroyka worries you? Perestroyka is a process which is taking place in the country. As for the conditions that have developed today, when interethnic relations have become exacerbated, they must be lived through. These issues must be addressed. After all, they existed in the past as well, but they were deep inside, they were veiled. And now that it has become possible to speak consciously and express one's view they have become exacerbated, and in some places have overstepped the boundaries of democracy in doing so. This has been seen in Azerbaijan and Armenia for the last two years.

We are not the only people in the world engaged in such conflicts. We are convinced that we shall find a solution. They must be resolved by political means. These are complex issues, but this should not be an obstacle for Australian businessmen.

Q: This morning you signed an agreement on fishing in Australian waters. How will you use the fish caught here? Yesterday you said that Japan and the United States are not displaying particular interest in the development of the Soviet Far East. What opportunities does this give, in your opinion, to Australia and what role could it play in the area of the Pacific Ocean bordering on the Soviet Union?

A: In the conversations, we touched upon the issue of fishing. Maybe, I am violating certain provisions in force in Australia, but, in my view, we have proposed a very interesting version. We consider that it is necessary to go further in the sphere of fishing than the agreement signed today. The point is that Australia possesses rich fish resources and does not have the capacity to use them. This also is inadmissable. It is inadmissable when people fish too much, and it is inadmissable when they do not catch what may be caught. Therefore we proposed such an option. We would agree to work here, of course, under certain conditions. The Australian side should define the quota for catches of fish. We work this way with other countries: We give part of the output to the state which offers its natural resources, and part remains for those who catch it—in this case, the Soviet Union. We have proposed to sell our share to Australia, not to convey the fish to the USSR, but to buy lamb for the money received. And to do this on a long-term basis. Calculations show that the business is mutually beneficial.

As for the Soviet Far East, then I repeat: There is no great aspiration by Japanese business circles to cooperate with the Soviet Union. If one speaks from the viewpoint of economic relations, then we know that the businessmen are reaching out toward us and would willingly work with us, but all that is very politicized there. As soon as things get down to specifics, then immediately the red light comes on and all actions are stopped. All this is done as if to say that, when the USSR gives back the four islands, then, allegedly, we will cooperate with them. If we continue to go round in circles concerning those four islands, then nothing good will come out of it. I think that the time will come when Japan will nevertheless review its position, and we will collaborate with it in the Far East.

As regards economic contacts with Australia in the Far East, I once again yesterday, at the meeting with business circles, invited them to cooperate. This year there will be an Australian exhibition in Vladivostok. Far East enterprises will be able to familiarize themselves in more detail with the possibilities of Australian firms. We hope that this will enable our economic relations to be expanded. Specifically, we have proposed several projects, including a tourist project. We are inviting Australia to cooperate in the Soviet Far East.

N.I. Ryzhkov also answered other questions from journalists.

Aleksey Voronin, Vadim Talanov.

Moscow TV Covers Visit's End

LD1502231590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Feb 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The official visit of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to Australia has ended.

[V. Ilyashenko] [video shows Ryzhkov signing document] This third and final day of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's stay in Australia began with the signing of Soviet-Australian documents. Three agreements were signed on trade, economic, and scientific cooperation. One of them deals with fishing in the Australian economic zone, another one with the commodity purchases of wheat and bauxite. In accordance with the third one, our countries will cooperate in the sphere of using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. An agreement was signed on ecology. Contacts between Soviet and Australian people will be made easier, as a result of an agreement having been concluded in the humanitarian sphere. Right after signing the documents, Australian Prime Minister Robert Hawke gave an interview to Soviet television.

[Begin recording] [Hawke in English with superimposed Russian translation] The visit by Prime Minister Ryzhkov has delivered very many results. We have managed to establish good personal relations, just as in Moscow two years ago with President Gorbachev. This is reflected in our having signed a large package of agreements encompassing a broad range of our cooperation. And I am sure that the visit of the head of the Soviet Government to our country will result in the expansion of economic ties. Mr. Ryzhkov has invited me to pay another visit to the USSR, and I am pleased to accept the invitation. So, we will keep this high level in our relations. [end recording]

[Ilyashenko] If you wish to see the real Australia, you must pay a visit to a farm. The owner of this one, Ian Kusa, told Nikolay Ivanovich about work at his farm. [passage omitted]

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited the AWH company, a major firm in the country which manufactures integrated circuits. The director general of the company told the Soviet guest about the manufacturing of microelectronic items and processes based on the latest achievements in the world. Australia is not as advanced in electronics as, say, Japan or the United States, but it is ready to share its achievements with our country.

Today, there was a news conference.

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] If one is to speak about this visit as a whole, I want to say straightaway that we are satisfied with the visit. We have discussed very many questions of an economic nature and have planned a number of interesting projects that have to be worked on. The Australian side supports perestroyka, supports the transformations that are taking place in the Soviet Union, and considers that this has to be passed through. We also touched on other issues. Well, primarily, of course, this applied to the Asian-Pacific region, with the emphasis on resolving the conflict in Cambodia. We exchanged detailed opinions on this question. All our conversations, all our meetings were constructive in nature. We met here like friends and, so, part even more convinced that our relations will develop. [end recording]

Departs, Flies to Singapore

LD1502234690 Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Sydney February 16 TASS—Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov left Sydney for Singapore today upon completion of his official visit to Australia. At the airport bedecked with Soviet and Australian state flags he was seen off by his Australian counterpart, Attorney-General Lionel Bowen, and officials of the New South Wales State.

Ryzhkov Begins Official Visit to Singapore

LD1602100690 Moscow TASS in English 0937 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Text] Singapore February 16 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov arrived here today for an official visit.

A welcoming ceremony for the head of the Soviet Government took place at the Istana Palace. The Soviet guest was welcomed by Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew.

Singapre Government ministers and members of Parliament, persons accompanying Ryzhkov in the tour, and Soviet Ambassador Anatoliy Dryukov were among those present at the ceremony.

A guard of honour was lined up outside the government house decked out with the state flags of Singapore and the Soviet Union, and the national anthems of the two countries were played.

Near East & South Asia

Iran, Turkey's Interests in Azerbaijan Viewed

LD1502122190 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Excerpts] At the time the unrest began in Dushanbe following rumors about the influx of Armenian refugees from Baku, capital of Azerbaijan, in Baku itself, there were arrivals from Iran to cross the Soviet border illegally. And it's not clear so far what their reasons were for appearing in the capital of Azerbaijan, but earlier there were reports about attempts to influence from the outside the events in that Soviet republic. Leaders of extremist groups in the Popular Front of Azerbaijan eagerly mention such things and picture them as general Muslim support for their slogans. But actually the attitudes to the events in Azerbaijan, both in Iran and in Turkey, is much more complex and contradictory. Mikhail Glebov has been monitoring the situation.

At the time some leaders in Iran and Turkey began to applaud the Popular Front of Azerbaijan, other leaders and politicians expressed clear misgivings. The UPI news agency noted that Iran reacted cautiously to the pro-Islamic unrest in Baku. UPI reported that in this way Iran had tried to avoid diplomatic complications with the Soviet Union; but it looks likely that the cause is deeper. The events in the Caucasus have already created problems for Iran itself. The Iranian Government was forced last month to move to prevent clashes between Azeris and Armenians on its own territory. The problems, however, are not confined to this. Azeris populate not only the southern Soviet republics but also some territories in Turkey and Iran. For this reason any calls for Azerbaijani unification can affect the vital interests of both countries.

In the meantime, according to some sources, the program of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan contains precisely the idea of creating a common state for all Azeris. [passage omitted]

When groups of Azeris began to destroy facilities along the Soviet-Iranian border, demanding the removal of the border in general and (?ensuring) the reunification of Azeris, Iranian border guards showed rather bluntly their attitude to such a prospect. They began to disperse the crowd that gathered on the Iranian side of the border by shooting over their heads.

Well, very much in the events in Azerbaijan causes serious concern both in Iran and in Turkey. [sentence as heard] Unlike some unbalanced leaders and fundamentalists, sober-minded politicians in these two countries obviously think in the first place about maintaining the stability in the region. And the leaders of the nationalist groups in Baku and the Azeri enclave of Nakhichaven are clearly exaggerating when they talk of general Muslim support in a bid to justify what they have already done in the (?Soviet Union).

NOVOSTI's Smirnov on Jewish Emigration

PM1502120690 London AL-MAJALLAH in Arabic 20 Feb 90 p 17

[Unattributed report: "Aleksandr Smirnov Tells AL-MAJALLAH: Odessa Jews Warned of Massacre, Started Emigrating"]

[Text] Dr Aleksandr Smirnov, deputy chief of NOVOSTI's Middle East desk, has emphasized that the Jews' right to emigrate to the occupied Palestinian territories conflicts entirely with the Palestinian people's right to defend themselves and their homeland. He urged official and social organizations in his country to speak out to prevent their former follow citizens from being used to feed war and as a tool in an aggression against another people who have a full historical and legal right to live on their own territory and in their own homeland.

In an interview conducted by AL-MAJALLAH's reporter in Moscow, Smirnov said: The Soviet Jews' emigration is helped by a disinformation campaign and false rumors launched by some media services inside and outside the Soviet Union. In recent months there has been a strange and suspicious campaign involving government and party organizations including the Odessa city party organization, which gave Jews warnings of destruction and other terrible things, telling them that a massacre would be committed against them in May. The objective of these rumors is to speed up the emigration of these Jews and to push them into the Israeli trap.

He added: The uneasy situation, the economic recession, the high inflation rate, and nationalist and social tensions encourage this emigration, which is taking place as a result of the efforts of foreign and internal Zionist forces. The general impression is that Zionist forces in our country want a massacre—albeit small—to take place against the Jews, so that it can be used as an excuse for expediting the emigration process. Washington granted these forces $700,000 on the pretext on helping the Jews fleeing the threat of death and persecution.

Smirnov said that his country does not bear sole responsibility for the Jews' emigration and their settlement in the Palestinian territories. He said: "There is U.S.-Israeli collusion, and Washington has continued to demand that the Soviet Union open the door to Jewish emigration. When the Soviet Union did so, Washington closed its door to them. That was done without the Soviet Government's knowledge or participation."

He cited the need to use diplomatic, legal, and informational means to limit the Jews' emigration to Palestine. "Diplomatically, the Soviet Union must use its weight to put pressure on Israel and the United States to prevent the Jews' settlement in the Palestinian territories. I believe that the Arab states can put similar pressure on Washington. Legally, I call on my country's government to limit the granting of exit visas to emigrating Jews, though I know in advance that it will cause an international outcry."

He called for Soviet-Arab informational coordination to convince emigrants of the potential risks, on the grounds that they will be occupying someone else's territory. He also said: I am confident that there are Jews who do not wish to emigrate to Israel, but the U.S. measure is forcing them to do so. On the other hand, there are those who believe that they are going to the (promised land), and they are ready to commit criminal acts against the Palestinian Arabs, so it would futile to address their dead reason and consciences.

Smirnov condemned the invitation sent to Israeli Trade and Industry Minister Ariel Sharon to visit Moscow. He also expressed his opposition to an expansion of economic relations between his country and Israel, urging his government to increase economic pressure on the Zionist state. He expressed his belief that an influx of Jews would have a negative impact on the Palestinian intifadah, to which he wished success. He said that they would enhance Israel's defense capability and become soldiers, policemen, and border guards.

Paper on Soviet Jews in Israel, War Threat

PM1402151790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Mikhail Krutikhin dispatch: "Grenades Under Pillows. What Awaits Emigrants From Soviet Union at Kibbutzim in Occupied Territories"]

[Excerpts] Cairo—"No, just try and imagine what sort of a country that is... I saw a turkey there actually weighing more than 38 kg... That is something else! Just look at what those Arabs have done with the Sinai Peninsula—the luxury that our people left behind, and they have already managed to totally neglect and make a mess of everything," according to one of our compatriots who, in the last few weeks, was given an opportunity to travel—via Egypt—to Israel at the invitation of his relatives and to come back, but for some reason he henceforth speaks of the Israelis as "our people."

Let us leave the record-breaking turkey to the enthusiastic traveler's conscience. And even the luxury inherited by the Arabs is hard to believe—I shall remember for the rest of my life the nightmarish sight of the ruined Syrian city of al-Qunaytirah in the Golan Heights, where soldiers from the "Israel Defense Forces," prior to withdrawing beyond the cease-fire line, methodically blew up one building after another, without sparing schools, mosques, or the Christian church. [passage omitted]

Statements by Prime Minister Y. Shamir and other Israeli figures about the settlement of immigrants arriving in Israel in the occupied Arab territories cause profound concern in the Soviet Union.

Practical steps to implement such schemes run contrary to universally accepted norms of international law, lead to the escalation of tension and growing confrontation and extremism in the Near East and specifically in the occupied territories, and create an even greater threat to human rights, to man's safety, to man's life itself.

People in the Soviet Union express the hope that Israel's Government will soberly assess the prevailing situation and will firmly and consistently adhere to the provisions of international law documents on human rights. This would conform with the interests of the State of Israel itself, a statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry says.

There is a stir around the growing number of Jews emigrating from the Soviet Union to Israel, and the overall psychological situation prevailing in the Near East is deteriorating. The mood of newspaper and journal items and a series of statements by local figures testify: Arabs and Israelis alike suspect that the outside world is fast losing interest in their problems. It is busy with the tumultuous processes of democratization and changes in the social system of the Soviet Union and East European countries, the initial tangible fruits of detente, the involvement of the vast masses of people in active public life. The world is breaking down the enemy image, bringing universal human values to the fore, and, to be honest, is fed up with the stubbornness of the parties to the Near East conflict which drive every effort at mediation into a deadlock. Nobody wants to help fan reciprocal malice.

This is why there is an especially sinister sound to the prediction of an early start of a new Arab-Israeli war made by the old Egyptian publicist Muhammad Haykal. In an attempt to attract international attention to their regional problems and to push the great powers into imposing yet another settlement formula on the Near East, hotheads among one of the parties to the conflict could embark on provoking an armed clash. Given the presence of a large quantity of modern weapons in the region, a war threatens to become exceptionally cruel and bloody.

Such a development of events could be prevented primarily by the Arabs and Israelis themselves. In such an event, turkeys would get fatter and people here would start living not behind the barbed wire of militarized settlements but in peaceful homes built with their own hands, shoulder to shoulder with good neighbors rather than sworn enemies.

Najibullah Grants Amnesty to Some Servicemen

LD1502120590 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Kabul February 15 TASS—Afghan President Najibullah granted amnesty to servicemen who did not commit grave crimes against national security.

On the first anniversary of the Soviet troop withdrawal, the Afghan national intermediary commission has sent a message to the commanders of those opposition groups that continue to wage war against the Afghan Government.

The document urged them to end the fratricidal war and advanced proposals to restore peace and security in Afghanistan.

In the past week clashes between government troops and rebels took place in the Nangarhar, Qandahar and Farah Provinces. More than 400 counterrevolutionaries were killed or wounded. Eleven government soldiers were killed and eight were wounded.

One of the rebel groups operating in the Kabul Province voluntarily turned over several "surface-to-surface" missiles and short-wave radio stations to the Afghan security forces on Wednesday [14 February].

Peace Prospects for Afghanistan Examined

Abdul Wakil Interviewed

LD1602002290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 90

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, 15 February, is exactly one year since Soviet troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan. In connection with this date, our New Delhi correspondent interviewed Abdul Wakil, the Republic of Afghanistan's minister of foreign affairs, who is currently on an official visit to India.

[Correspondent Sergey Alekseyev in English with superimposed Russian translation] Not so long ago, we happened to be in Peshawar where we met some representatives of the so-called transitional government of the mujahidin, who claimed that they were in control of nearly 90 percent of the country and that they were supported by a majority of the Afghan people. However, a year after the Soviet troop withdrawal, they are still in Peshawar, while you are in Kabul. And it is you, rather than they, who are being received today on an official visit to friendly India.

[Abdul Wakil in Dari with superimposed Russian translation] The declaration you are talking about shows that overt and covert forces hostile to the Afghan people still, unfortunately, exist and are active. But, a year later, life actually proves who, what government, satisfies the Afghan people and enjoys its support. Our government regards foreign interference in our internal affairs as the main obstacle to restoring peace in Afghanistan. We Afghans are aware of that hard reality, but hope, nevertheless, that time will cure everything.

[Alekseyev] Bearing in mind what has been said, how do you see the nearest prospects for the development of the situation in your country?

[Wakil] I'm sure that without interference in Afghanistan's affairs from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other states, peace soon can be restored on Afghan soil. We will do everything possible to that end.

U.S. Stance: No. 1 Obstacle

PM1502105190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Feature prepared by P. Timofeyev under rubric "Afghanistan: One Year On: We Left"]

[Excerpts] On 15 February last year, the last Soviet soldier left Afghan soil, but reports from that country still resemble front-line dispatches. The fratricidal war is continuing. Afghanistan today is probably the "hottest" spot on the planet. The interests of a whole series of states are interwoven there, and world outlooks and political forces of very different trends have clashed there.

How do people in Afghanistan itself assess the results of the past year, and which settlement path do they consider most acceptable? Andrey Pravov, APN's and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's own correspondent in Kabul, speaks about this.

I quite frequently have occasion to visit this amber-yellow palace with openwork windows located on a rise behind the Afghan Defense Ministry building. A year ago the staff of our 40th Army, known as the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in Afghanistan, was located here, but today it is the Main Political Directorate of the Army of the Republic of Afghanistan. Officers and generals in Afghan uniform have long been at home in the palace's offices. We met with one of them.

Major General 'Abdul Wahed of the government troops:

"In my opinion," the general said, "the chief result of the past year is the greatly increased combat spirit and morale of the officers and men of our armed forces. They have realized perfectly well that they can win victories. A year ago, when your troops were departing, some still felt a degree of uncertainty about their potential. This was aided by skillful enemy propaganda supported by Western mass media....

"I remember that back in April Western correspondents in the capital's Intercontinental Hotel were wagering on how long the government could cling to power. They were impatient to send their editors striking reportages on the fears of a storming of the capital and on the triumphal entry of armed detachments of 'fighters for the faith' into the city.

"It was a very difficult time for us," Maj Gen Wahed recalled, "but the majority of professional soldiers were sure that we would be able to counter the enemy onslaught."

[Pravov] "Which military operation during the past year do you consider most important, perhaps even crucial?"

[Wahed] "The defense of Jalalabad. We compare it with the Battle of Stalingrad which, as we know, changed the course of World War II. People really realized who their defenders were. In Jalalabad, the population was mainly hiding in the basements of buildings, in dugouts and slit trenches, while soldiers and officers were risking their lives to get water, food, and medical supplies to them there."

'Abdul Wahed said that, according to eyewitnesses, the "intransigents" then mounted propaganda in Peshawar, agitating for Afghan refugees to take part in the battle for Jalalabad. The chief argument was that the government troops would quickly scatter and the city would be handed over to the besieging forces. The main trade there is carried on by Hindus, i.e. "infidels" to the mujahidin. It was their rich stalls that were being offered in payment for participating in the siege. Very soon bodies began to be delivered to the refugee camps instead of sacks of goods, and this had the effect of a cold shower on many people. The number of volunteers quickly fell to zero.

[Pravov] "One explanation for all these failures of the 'intransigents' which is current in the West is the claim that they accumulated experience in guerrilla warfare but have no idea of how to conduct combat operations as a regular army. Do you share that opinion?"

[Wahed] "The enemy has more than enough foreign military advisers today. There are people to plan operations. In addition, a large number of Pakistani and Arab mercenaries are fighting on the enemy side. Many of them are professional soldiers. That is not the point. The point is that the 'fighters for the faith' have lost the trust of the people both in Afghanistan itself and in the refugee camps. It seems to me that, if they had agreed to the government's peace proposals a year ago, when the Soviet troops were leaving, they would have gained a greater political advantage for themselves. The continuation of military operations is increasingly unpopular. People are tired. Many armed detachments which earlier were fighting against the government troops are now either siding entirely with us or prefer neutrality. It seems to me that this process will continue developing." [Passage omitted]

N. Simonin, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations:

"The past year has advanced the resolution of the Afghan problem. The Kabul government has not weakened during this year. On the contrary, it has strengthened its positions. This is on the one hand. But, on the other, it has become obvious to everyone that the opposition claim that it represents the entire Afghan people and that, having overthrown the 'Kabul regime,' it will accede to power is groundless. The opposition has shown that it is incapable of being an alternative to anyone, since it cannot consolidate itself. There is constant internecine quarreling in the opposition camp. This confirms yet again that the settlement process is impossible without the Kabul government's participation.

"What is hindering a faster settlement? In my view, the no. 1 obstacle is the U.S. position. It is true that there have been certain moves here too in recent months. The United States sees that the wall cannot be breached with a frontal attack, although it stubbornly insisted for too long on the realization of a military solution to the problem. It continues to support the most fundamentalist opposition forces, if I can put it like that. It cannot proclaim the ideals of democracy and the peaceful resolution of problems all the time on the one hand while virtually supporting a fratricidal war on the other.

"In my view, it would be very useful to involve Zahir Shah, the former Afghan monarch, in the settlement process. It is not up to us to decide in what form, but that would play a positive role in strengthening Afghanistan's statehood. All forces which can work today for a certain level of centralization must be involved in the process of a peace settlement."

East Europe

TASS Cites CTK on USSR Troop Withdrawal

LD1502235490 Moscow TASS in English 2334 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Prague February 16 TASS—A meeting of a working group of Soviet and Czechoslovak experts to discuss military-technical and organisational problems of Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia was held in Prague, according to CTK. The meeting participants reached an agreement on the beginning of Soviet troop pullout from Czechoslovakia on February 26 this year. A commission on practical implementation of the agreement will start its work on February 16.

The Soviet side pledged to lower the intensity of combat training. Military exercises are to be held in agreement with the local authorities.

The commissions of both countries are expected to hold talks in Prague one of these days on complete withdrawal of Soviet troops.

CSSR Defense Leadership, Policy Altered

PM1502144390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Feb 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "M. Vacek Press Conference"]

[Text] Prague, 12 Feb—It has been decided that this year there will be no military parades in Prague or Bratislava. The number of reservists called up for training and retraining will be cut by 90,000. This was announced by CSSR National Defense Minister M. Vacek at a press conference here.

Answering journalists' questions, he stated that in view of citizens' opinions the Army is seeking to restrict flights by warplanes to two days a week. He agreed that this will create problems for pilot training. In M. Vacek's words, a U.S. Air Force airman spends around 250 hours a year airborne whereas a CSSR flier spends only 70 hours. The minister announced that the guarding of Prague Castle has been entrusted to the Czechoslovak Army. On 1 April military counterintelligence, formerly part of the state security structure, will be placed under the jurisdiction of the National Defense Ministry too.

He spoke on the question of organizing an alternative form of military service. In his opinion, work at national economic installations by people who for various reasons refuse military service should be at least half as long again as the period of the regular draft.

A. Rasek, deputy national defense minister, announced in his speech that representatives of political organs have been removed from the Army leadership. Some other generals will soon leave too.

As the CTK news agency reported, President Havel has relieved L. Adamec, K. Urbanek, and a number of other former party and state leaders of their duties as members of the Czechoslovak National Defense Council.

M. Calfa, head of the government, has been appointed chairman of the Defense Council, with V. Komarek as his deputy. V. Dlouhy, P. Pittart, M. Cic, J. Dienstbier, R. Sacher, and J. Krizan have been appointed members of the Defense Council. National Defense Minister Vacek remains a council member.

Bogomolov Views Changes in East Europe

LD1502215890 Prague CTK in English 1457 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Prague Feb 15 (CTK)—The process of changes in Eastern Europe favourably influences both European policy and the position of the Soviet Union in international relations, Academician Oleg Bogomolov, the director of the Institute of Economy of the World Socialist System of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said at a press conference here today.

It was the "perestroika" in the Soviet Union that was an impulse for revolutionary processes in Eastern Europe, Oleg Bogomolov pointed out, adding that at present, these processes favourably influence further progress of restructuring in the Soviet Union itself.

The new policy of the Soviet party and state leadership put an end to the Brezhnev doctrine which had kept back independent development of East European countries. However, good friendly relations among nations of the Soviet Union and nations of East European countries represent an important factor of building a new Europe and therefore they should not be abandoned. On the contrary they should be deepened on the new foundations of equal rights, mutual understanding and respect, the Soviet academician stated.

However, Oleg Bogomolov at the same time admitted insufficient general knowledge of Soviet society of what actually happened and what are further developments in Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Poland, Hungary and partly also in Romania and Bulgaria.

Polish Defense Minister on Soviet Troop Presence

LD1502232790 Moscow TASS in English 2312 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Warsaw February 16 TASS—The interests of the Polish state demand a serious approach to a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland, a complicated and important problem which is significant not only for Poland, noted General Florian Siwicki, Polish defense minister.

He conveyed a statement to the PAP news agency on Thursday in connection with the expressed desire of the Soviet leadership to begin talks on this issue.

The northern group of the Soviet Army numbering 50,000 is deployed in Poland. Along with Soviet troops in Germany, the group guarantees the military balance in this part of Europe, the document says.

Therefore, this issue should be regarded from a political and strategic viewpoint.

Poland believes that progress at the disarmament talks on conventional weapons will also help cut the numerical strength of Soviet troops in Poland.

"Stormy processes in our Western neighbours may proceed towards a change in the hitherto alignment of forces in a short time," noted Siwicki.

"Therefore I think the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland, which is evident in future, should be approached cautiously, without emotions".

The Polish leaders should be guided, above all, by national interests: the country's security and guarantees of inviolability of its borders, he stressed.

Jaruzelski's Stand on German Issue Clarified

LD1402000390 Moscow TASS in English 2349 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Text] Warsaw February 14 TASS—Poland's stance concerning German reunification and its attitude towards the German issue are unchangeable and consistent, Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski's spokesman told journalists to clarify the president's position.

Without disputing the right of each nation to self-determination, we do not deny this right to Germans, including the possibility of shaping their own statehood on conditions which take into account peaceful coexistence, security and the inviolability of the borders of all European countries, he noted.

Concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland, the Polish president stressed the interrelation of this issue with the European situation as a whole, the spokesman said.

Soviet troops stationed in Poland are a component in the structure which ensures equilibrium in Europe and an important guarantor of security of Poland's western borders.

Their withdrawal may, therefore, be only a result of the favourable development of the situation in German and European territory, including the eventual recognition of the Polish borders.

In this respect Poland must receive guarantees from the great powers. The Soviet Union provides such guarantees.

Asked if this stance of the Polish president corresponds to the Soviet point of view expressed during the recent visit of Chancellor Helmut Kohl to Moscow, the presidential spokesman answered in the affirmative. He said that Wojciech Jaruzelski had had a telephone conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev relating to Kohl's visit to Moscow.

PRAVDA Account

PM1502164990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Poland's Position"]

[Text] Warsaw, 14 Feb—Poland's position on the question of Germany's unification is immutable and consistent, W. Lozinski, press spokesman for the president of the Republic of Poland, told PAP, explaining the head of state's position. Not disputing the right of any nation to self-determination, we also do not deny the Germans the possibility of forming their own statehood. At the same time, however, the principles of peaceful coexistence and the inviolability of borders must be observed, and the security interests of European countries must be taken into account, he pointed out.

Speaking of the possibility of a Soviet troop withdrawal from the country, the Polish president's spokesman emphasized the connection between this problem and the European situation as a whole. The Soviet troops in Poland are an element in a structure which ensures equilibrium in Europe and an important factor in guaranteeing the security of Poland's western borders, he declared. Their withdrawal could be a consequence of favorable development on the territory of Germany and Europe, including the final recognition of Poland's borders. Poland must also receive guarantees on this question from the great powers. The Soviet Union has given such guarantees.

Caution Urged on German Unification

PM1402151390 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 14 Feb 90 p 3

["Observer's Notes" by TASS correspondent I. Osinskiy: "Look Before You Leap, or Possible Consequences of Germanys' Hasty Unification"]

[Text] When Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, made public his concept for the unification of Germany, a commentator for the youth newspaper JUNGE WELT exclaimed in a fit of temper: This plan is good for everyone, but it does not say when and how this will happen!

Whatever subject I discuss with residents of the GDR nowadays, sooner or later it boils down to the question of whether Germany should be united. A topic which only yesterday was forbidden is today exciting the minds of millions of people.

As a recent public opinion poll attests, approximately three-fourths of the GDR's population advocates Germany's reunification (in November it was only 48 percent). And 38 percent of those polled believe that this must be done without delay. FRG residents also take a roughly similar attitude to the German-German problem.

The two German states today resemble magnets whose polarity has changed—quite recently they repelled each other, but now they attract. Sometimes the impression is even created that parties and political groupings have entered an unannounced competition as to who will propose the most radical and bold path to the nation's unity. At the same time, whereas right after the opening of the state border the Western side's voice sounded considerably louder, the initiative has now clearly passed to the GDR. Here are just a few "hot" ideas taken fresh from the political "oven," as it were.

Manfred Gerlach, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany (GDR), has proposed holding a referendum on German unity in both countries, after which the FRG and GDR parliaments should meet for a joint session and elect Richard von Weizsaecker as president of Germany.... A demand is being heard increasingly loudly for Berlin to be united and made the capital of a unified state....

A joint finance committee has been set up to draw up terms for the GDR currency system to go over to the FRG mark. True, the most cautious politicians are proposing that events not be rushed in this direction. The GDR already has more than 50,000 unemployed. As the national economy goes over to a market economy mechanism, the numbers of unemployed will increase. And this means that the FRG would have to pay them corresponding benefits....

West Germany's APA has advanced a proposal to abolish ADN and is ready to provide the newspapers and journals published in the GDR with the necessary information. This time people in the GDR have begun to be concerned. There is already a surplus of journalists here. ADN is conducting a mass collection of signatures for the preservation of the country's independent news service....

Walter Momper, West Berlin's ruling mayor, believes that there is no need for the GDR to maintain the National People's Army. He proposes entrusting the Bundeswehr with the duties of ensuring the two countries' security, while at the same time retaining the military contingents of the USSR and the other victor-powers. In his opinion, it is necessary without delay to reduce the administrative-territorial division of the two states to a common denominator, namely to transform the 15 GDR bezirks into the five lands which existed here prior to 1952 and to elect their parliaments in the municipal elections scheduled for 6 May, granting them the legislative right to resolve the question of joining with the FRG. The population of those that adopt this decision could participate in this year's 2 December Bundestag elections on equal terms with FRG residents....

As we see, there is no shortage of ideas. The situation is far more difficult as regards arguments in support of them. Most frequently people simply forget about them. Emotions are clearly gaining the upper hand. People in the FRG are dreaming that a united Germany will still further strengthen their political clout and become the undisputed favorite in the western part of the European Continent. And for the sake of this they will agree to the considerable cost involved in extricating the weakened GDR economy from its crisis and narrowing the gap between the living standards of the two countries' populations closer. The hope that, by coupling themselves to the powerful West German "locomotive," it will be possible at once and without difficulty to solve social problems which are considered insuperable today and to rush forward at full steam ahead seems increasingly alluring to many people in the GDR too.

When and how? While in no way belittling the significance of these questions, I believe that another one should be added to them—that of the possible consequences. If families fall apart because two people are "incompatible," what can one say of peoples who have lived for 40 years under conditions of different sociopolitical systems! The threat that alien social elements will tear away is 100 times greater here. And this would bring millions of people not well-being and happiness but disappointment and quite unjustified suffering. Alarming symptoms warning against hasty decisions can already be detected today....

H. Modrow's concept, which has received the USSR's support in principle, provides that a unified Germany will be a neutral state belonging to no military bloc. The Soviet Union, as is known, has declared that it is ready to withdraw all its troops from GDR territory within 5 years if the Western powers do precisely likewise with their troops stationed on FRG territory. In the GDR this initiative has received the support of the majority of parties and political groupings and is near to the hearts of and comprehensible to the country's population.

Bonn has made the opposite response. We do not picture the future Germany outside NATO, people there have declared. In the opinion of West German politicians, the world public does not have the slightest grounds for fearing a revival of revanchism or the danger of a new world war arising from German soil.

The facts, alas, attest to the reverse. The neo-Nazi "Republican" Party has undertaken vigorous actions, achieved considerable successes in the FRG and West Berlin, and intends to extend its influence to the GDR. Its revanchist voice can be heard increasingly frequently at demonstrations and rallies here.

It is also a far from simple matter, as it might seem, to combine the two countries' economies. The GDR national economy is managed by the same old administrative-edict system and operates under conditions of centralized state planning. The concept for switching to a market mechanism, in whose elaboration more than 200 of the country's leading scientists and experts participated, has now been submitted to the government. But the document's authors do not hide the fact that it will take considerable time and... money to realize their ideas. At least 40 billion currency marks, which the state budget does not have, are needed just for the most urgent measures with regard to reorganization.

And, finally, the social aspect is, perhaps, the most complex and painful aspect, although it is mentioned least of all. Even the first steps in the direction of a market economy have led to the gradual elimination of social gains. This, alas, is not the author's imagination but is evidenced by the central GDR press itself.

A large-scale program is planned to transform medical services—the private sector will predominate here too. Similar changes will also occur in other social spheres. The GDR population is not ready for them psychologically.

It has long been known that there are no rough drafts in history—it is written at once without corrections and erasures. This is why folk wisdom advises: When embarking on something important, you must look before you leap. Particularly when there are painful decisions to be made.

TASS Cites ADN on Monetary Union

LD1402065590 Moscow TASS in English 0600 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] Berlin 13/2/TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

Bonn (ADN)—The GDR and the FRG will immediately open negotiations on a currency union and economic community. This is the most important result on Tuesday of the German-German summit in the FRG capital.

GDR Prime Minister Hans Modrow, who is in Bonn for a working visit, heads a 17-strong delegation including eight ministers of new opposition parties and movements.

Modrow and his FRG counterpart Helmut Kohl told the world press in the afternoon there was now a chance of completing German unity and that unification had to be embedded in the all-European development. The justified interests and security needs of neighbours should be taken into account on the road towards German unity.

Kohl said German neutrality, however, as demanded by the Warsaw Treaty member states, was out of the question.

Already now preparations had to be made for ushering in a process in the direction of currency and economic union after GDR parliamentary elections on March 18, Modrow told the newsmen. Experts would meet over the matter next week. He made an impassioned appeal to his fellow countrymen not to leave their home country.

In Kohl's view, the GDR mark is to be replaced in the GDR by the deutschmark at a set date. At the same time, he said, the GDR had to create the prerequisites for a social market-oriented economy, within its offer the FRG would be contributing the deutschmark, its strongest economic asset.

After the press conference Modrow had talks with FRG President Richard von Weizsaecker who said there was a unique historic chance in the wake of a peaceful development in the GDR to embark upon the road of unity in partnership with Germany's neighbours.

In the evening Modrow met senior officials of FRG parliamentary parties. Talks with leading industrialists and bankers are due on Tuesday.

Along with the talks at prime ministerial level meetings took place between GDR Economics Ministers Christa Luft and her FRG counterpart Helmut Haussmann and the building industry and agriculture ministers.

Latin America & Caribbean

Commentary on Upcoming Colombia Drug Summit

PY1502200190 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Leonid Levchenko commentary]

[Text] The Presidents of the United States, Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru will meet in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, on 15 February, to discuss (?measures) to be adopted against drug trafficking. Leonid Levchencko comments the following on this subject:

The importance of the drug trafficking problem to be discussed at the summit is evident. Despite this being an international problem, the impact it has on the Andean Region will be discussed in Cartagena. A special UN General Assembly session will be held afterward to discuss international cooperation in the fight against drug traffickers.

I consider the experience obtained in the Andean countries, particularly in Colombia, will be used for those countries where the production and illegal sale of the white death has reached its highest point. The drug trafficking routes have been precisely established and it has been proven that they include the great West European centers and the United States.

It is clear that [words indistinct] demand measures to stop drug trafficking and to reduce drug consumption in the United States, and that, nowadays, it depends on the fight against this scourge.

Last month, President Bush announced the U.S. national strategy to control the drugs in 1990. This is the second stage of the fight against drugs that was announced last year in the United States. It is still early to comment on the strategy's effectiveness, mostly because a few days ago [word indistinct] the U.S. Administration policy to solve the drug problem was criticized in an international conference held in Lima.

This conference was organized by the Andean Jurists Committee. The most important jurists attending the conference were very firm in rejecting the U.S. Administration's plans to use U.S. troops to fight drug trafficking. They voiced their fear that, under this pretext, Washington would conduct a military intervention in other counties, as it did against Panama.

The lack of popularity of these military measures forced the United States to give up the idea of establishing a naval blockade of the Colombian coast. In a news conference at the White House yesterday, President George Bush asserted that the United States will not insist on using military force in the fight against the drugs.

In this respect, it would be more logical if the United States were to help its southern neighbors to climb out of the abyss created by their foreign debt and grant these countries more egalitarian conditions of trade instead of insisting on the repressive ending of the drug trade.

Colombia, for example, has received U.S. help to fight the drug trafficking cartels. (?It practically lost this help in view of the low prices paid for the coffee it exported to the U.S. market.)

[Words indistinct] aforementioned international conference of jurists, pointed out that the best methods to fight drug trafficking would be the creation of a new international economic order, the solution of the foreign debt problem, and the opening of the U.S. and West European markets for the agricultural products of the Andean countries.

The Andean Parliament has proposed that the United States convert the Bolivian, Colombian, and Peruvian foreign debts into a fund to finance the fight against drug trafficking.

In my opinion, this is an interesting proposal. How will the United States receive it?

Supreme Soviet Session

16 Feb Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

Resumes Discussing Property Bill

LD1602074790 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 16 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The USSR Supreme Soviet continued the discussion of a crucial property bill at a joint sitting of the Soviet parliament's two chambers today.

The discussion is expected to be completed in the first half of the day so that parliamentary committees and commissions could sum up deputies' proposals before the article-by-article voting, scheduled for next week.

The sitting is being chaired by First Vice President Anatoliy Lukyanov.

'Soyuz' To Resist USSR Breakup

LD1602092190 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 16 Feb 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow February 16 TASS—A deputies' group, Soyuz, has been set up in the Soviet parliament. The main purpose of the group, which unites representatives from various regions of the country, is to "resist the break-up of the USSR", Georgiy Komarov, director of one of Kirghiz research institutes (Central Asia), told the parliament this morning.

The members of the group stated that they would strive against separatism, nationalism and chauvinism. They intend to promote the elaboration of laws to get the country out of socio-economic crises.

The group Soyuz already comprises more than a hundred members of parliament, i.e. approximately one-fifth of Supreme Soviet members, Komarov said.

Moscow TV Carries Supreme Soviet Coverage 15 Feb

Lukyanov Chairs Session

LD1502172890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 15 February link up and begin carrying a recorded relay of the 15 February session of the Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin.

At 1600 GMT a video shows the Supreme Soviet in session with Lukyanov in the chair. Lukyanov asks deputies to register: 447 are present. The session is declared open. Lukyanov reports that the chamber chairmen have discussed the agenda since yesterday and that voters have been calling in to urge the Supreme Soviet to get down to business as soon as possible. He proposes that discussion of the law on ownership start this morning; procedural matters this evening; law on land tomorrow; joint closed session on Tanscaucasian events on Monday morning; separate sessions will be held subsequently. The proposal passed without a vote.

At 1604 GMT Lukyanov announces discussion of law on ownership, which it was discussed in the first reading at the Second Session of the Supreme Soviet. Work has been done by the relevant commission in the meantime. The commission is chaired by Abalkin, whom Lukyanov calls to the floor.

At 1606 GMT Abalkin speaks of the lively interest and clashes of opinions aroused by the bill and sums up it passage through parliament so far, up to the establishment of the commission on 20 November. Working groups have been set up, discussing the published draft and alternatives. He summarizes the content of the discussion in the commission and working groups. Differences have remained, but the draft distributed to deputies reflects a common position. He sets out the agreed concept of the proposed bill, stressing its radical character and its importance for both economic and political reforms. Diversity of forms of ownership is enshrined in the bill, which recognizes their legitimate co-existence. Local conditions determine which form is best. There is no attempt to predetermine which forms of ownership can exist. The bill provides for equal rights for all forms. Individual ownership must be guarded against state interference, and vice-versa.

At 1617 GMT Abalkin talks of the bill in the context of the transition to the planned market economy and efforts to impart dynamism to socialism. He says forms and structures are needed which ensure the greatest efficiency of production and social safeguards for the public. Ownership must rule out man's exploitation of his fellow man, which includes the stablishment of bureaucratic and administrative-edict structures.

At 1623 GMT Abalkin moves to the issue of hired labor, a concept used in many different meanings, which he lists. He acknowledges the social burden attached to the notion. The bill enshrines the citizen's right to use his abilities as he sees fit.

At 1627 GMT Abalkin addresses the structure of ownership relations, and outlines the various types of ownership relations, and outlines the various types of ownership provided for in the bill, dwelling on the peculiarities of each. Under citizens' ownership, he notes that the concept "private ownership" has been consciously avoided, for in Western usage it means everything not covered by state ownership. He goes into the historical background of the concept. The amended draft adds a new article envisaging citizens' ownership of their homes.

Abalkin on Ownership

LD1502175190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continue to relay the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 1635 GMT Abalkin deals with articles covering sources of citizens' property, including shares and savings from earned income. He dwells at length on the theoretical background to this and acknowledges that differences remain.

At 1640 GMT cooperative, leasehold, and joint-stock forms are covered. Leasing is a form of management, now ownership. Abalkin says the commission decided to keep cooperative and collective forms separate in the draft and explains why.

At 1642 GMT Abalkin notes that state ownership has come to be regarded as the source of the administrative-edict system, but adds that it is a form which exists in many countries with predominantly market-based economies. The main thing is to renew state ownership radically, not to ditch it. Abalkin outlines ways of achieving this, which are contained in the draft. Self-management at all levels is a key element. The workforce at state enterprises must be given real power at their workplace. He outlines articles covering these points. A proportion of profits should be transferred to members of the workforce, with rights to dispose of it as they see fit. Abalkin explains why he considers this important: It puts state ownership on the same footing as cooperative ownership and enables it to compete on equal terms.

At 1649 GMT Abalkin goes on to the question of privatization of state enterprises. He warns of the dangers of asset-stripping of state property and proposes the creation of bodies to manage and regulate the use of state property, to safeguard it against asset-stripping.

At 1652 GMT Abalkin goes on to ownership of land and natural resources and the use thereof. He sums up the results of the discussion of the issue in the commission and working groups, which considered that a final decision should be delayed until the matter of a federal state structure of the USSR has been settled, for it touches on the issue of sovereignty.

At 1655 GMT Abalkin, in conclusion, muses on the nature of laws in general, urging deputies to avoid loose talk in discussing them. The necessary balance is a delicate thing and must be protected. He anticipates accusations of excessive conservatism and radicalism, calling on deputies for wisdom when they come to vote. He warns against illusions: the process outlined will take decades to work fully.

At 1658 GMT Abalkin finishes speaking. A 15-minute interval is announced by the continuity announcer.

Kalmykov on Ownership

LD1502183390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continue to relay the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 1714 GMT the session resumes after its interval. Lukyanov suggests the way the debate should be organized. Lukyanov gives the floor to Kalmykov of the Supreme Soviet Legislation Committee. Kalmykov tells of the work the committee did in drawing up the law. The alternative versions of the law were not totally rejected; some of their concepts have been included in the present version. However, some of the alternative versions' concepts were unacceptable and have not been included.

At 1720 GMT Kalmykov says that the ecologists wanted to make the atmosphere an element of property but no other country's legislation has such a concept and it has not been included.

At 1723 GMT Kalmykov notes that this law is of great importance at the constitutional level. The preamble to the law sets out its purpose as serving the interests of the citizen. Article 2 was altered to exclude governmental inference in the operation of the law, but Kalmykov says that he thinks the change is unjustified.

At 1729 GMT Kalmykov discusses the way intellectual property is covered. He notes small private enterprises already exist in China and East Europe. There should be a list of articles which cannot pass into private ownership, such as railways and aircraft.

At 1734 GMT Kalmykov says the law covers land ownership. It will prevent land passing into the possession of millionaires.

At 1737 GMT Lukyanov gives the floor to A.N. Boyko, of the Supreme Soviet committee on economic reform.

At 1738 GMT Boyko relates some attacks on the law which his committee has received; some call it counterrevolutionary. He discusses the preamble's treatment of the terms "socialist property", "exploitation", the difference between "state" and "people's" property. Opponents of the law have not offered any specific proposals.

At 1745 GMT Boyko discusses the reasons for some of the alterations which have been made in the present version of the law. Workers should get a share of the profit from enterprises where they work as hired labor. If owners do not like this, they are free to do all the work themselves.

At 1750 GMT Boyko says the responsibilities of enterprise owners deserve extra payment over and above payment for their labor.

Abalkin Answers Questions

LD1502185490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continue to relay the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 1752 GMT Lukyanov invites Abalkin to the microphone to answer questions which he has received in written form from deputies.

At 1753 GMT Abalkin replies to questions about those working in the Far North, about the different forms of ownership. He says he is not representing the Council of Ministers on this law. He replies briefly to various other minor points.

At 1757 GMT Abalkin speaks in favor of share ownership by workers in various enterprises where part of their pay should be invested in their enterprises.

At 1800 GMT Abalkin continues giving brief replies to questions on various points of law. He reads out a letter whose writer suggests putting the law to referendum. Abalkin explains why this is not a good idea.

At 1807 GMT Abalkin quotes various articles of the law in reply to questions sent in by deputies.

At 1814 GMT Abalkin says a change in the forms of ownership might lead to a change in the social structure of the USSR and the employment pattern.

At 1817 GMT Lukyanov asks the hall if they want to continue listening to these questions. The hall affirms that they do. Abalkin continues replying to deputies' questions.

At 1820 GMT Abalkin ends. Lukyanov says that 20 people have asked to speak in the debate and announces an interval.

Vote Called on Proposals

LD1502194390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continue to relay the Supreme Soviet Session in Moscow.

At 1821 GMT at the start of the next session, Lukyanov introduces the debate on the report.

At 1823 GMT Deputy (Menuzbekyan) speaks about the rights of autonomous formations to ownership of land and questions the wording of various articles of the law. He calls for a vote to be taken on his proposals.

At 1828 GMT Deputy Orlov quotes various articles on the various forms of ownership and suggests improvements in the wording.

At 1832 GMT Deputy Sukhov says he will vote against the law on ownership. While these discussions are going on, things are getting worse in the country. The law should be put to referendum. The status of the federation should be decided first—the whole future course of the country. The party should adhere to a more pure ideology.

At 1842 GMT Deputy Kutepov speaks of the communal rights of the enterprise. He suggests changes to Article 25 to clarify and improve matters. Ownership of enterprises should be transferred to the workers.

At 1847 GMT deputy Denisov gives the views of the ecology committee which put forward its own version of the law. He says that the law does not define its concepts sufficiently clearly. People do not really know what they are voting for. He attacks the idea of state capitalism and state property as unsocialist. All profit should be taken in tax for the good of the whole of society.

At 1854 GMT Deputy Bobritskiy supports the official version of the law. It should be passed and implemented as soon as possible. He presents questions about the practical implementation of the law.

At 1857 GMT Deputy Nosov recalls the Bolsheviks' slogan of land to the peasants. The present law will allow land to pass to the rich, who are not workers. Lenin gave land to the peasants but Stalin took it from them again. Peasants should be given the chance to work the land themselves by their own labor and not by private property. Nosov waves a copy of Lenin's Decree on Land and says it should be implemented.

At 1904 GMT Deputy Yudin says that all opportunities for exploitation should be eliminated from the law. He suggests how the working of various articles could be improved.

At 1909 GMT Deputy Boldyrev points out contradictions between this law and the law on local government and suggests ways of coordinating their terminology. He supports Denisov on the question of exploitation which often arises from monopoly. He says that there should be a free market in capital investment.

At 1916 GMT Deputy Suleymenov supports the proposal of Fominykh on the wording of an article which affects local rights. He notes that in Kazakhstan the vast majority of production capacity is controlled from the center.

At 1920 GMT deputy Sevryukov says that monetary reform should be carried out before the law is adopted in order to prevent representatives of the shadow economy from buying up shares, and makes proposals of his own.

At 1923 GMT Deputy Voblikov observes that the present discussion concerns just economic liberty and pleads for consideration of other types.

At 1927 GMT Deputy Zhuravlev proposals an amendment to the law's title emphasizing that it applies to both the Union and the republics. He makes proposals concerning the definition of ownership and other articles.

At 1931 GMT Lukyanov asks speakers to abide by parliamentary ethics and avoid name-calling, then offers the floor to Deputy Ubaydullayeva, who says economic policy should not be considered in isolation from other aspects. She calls for consideration of the plight of the unemployed and raises other points of local concern to Uzbek deputies. She is against a referendum on the bill.

Call For Ownership Definition

LD1502204490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Service in Russian continue to relay the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 1938 GMT Deputy Korshunov says that private ownership exists, however it is defined, and calls for effective controls on all types of ownership. He expresses views on specific articles in the bill.

At 1943 GMT Lukuanov suggests that discussion continue for one more hour after the interval. The proposal is passed without a vote. Nishanov makes a few procedural announcements. Another, unseen, speaker makes an announcement. The session is closed.

At 1945 GMT Lukyanov opens the next session, repeats his proposal for one more hour to be spent on the discussion. Proposal agreed without vote.

At 1946 GMT Deputy Saunin takes the floor. He considers the law as it relates to the individual as consumer and producer. It is wrong that private ownership should be equated with capitalism, for ownership is a natural human instinct. He asks for clear definition of ownership of land and other provisions in the draft.

At 1953 GMT Deputy Kasyanov says that if it is planned to go over to a market economy, the bill should provide for it fully; mincing of words helps nobody. He calls for clarity regarding ownership in the proposed special economic zones.

At 1957 GMT Deputy Vasilyets calls for a clear definition of ownership by enterprises and makes proposals on the wording of the bill to this effect.

At 2002 GMT Deputy Bronshteyn says there should be no fear of the term "private ownership". He expresses views on the ownership of land and natural resources in various regions. Common ownership by the whole Soviet people means ownership by departments. He proposes special arrangements to overcome differences in wealth between republics without returning to departmental rule.

AT 2007 GMT Deputy Golyakov speaks of the law as a navigation aid for sailors and makes a proposal on a specific point.

At 2010 GMT Deputy Allayarov raises the issue of ownership of water, calling for union republics to have control over rivers and lakes situated on their territory. He calls for a special law on water. He supports the bill.

At 2014 GMT Deputy Stepanov complains that equality of all forms of ownership is not guaranteed in the bill, for collective and state enterprises are at a disadvantage. He makes proposals to rectify problem and calls for full discussion of amendements before the bill is voted on.

At 2018 GMT Deputy Khadzhiyev regrets that peasants do not have a right equivalent to that of industrial workers to buy shares in their enterprises. He calls for decentralization of industry and the dismantling of monopolies.

At 2024 GMT Justice Minister Yakovlev says in general terms that the present draft is an improvement on the first version and praises the professionalism of its drafting, for the terminology is in line with international usage. He cites individual parts which he considers particularly good in this regard. He urges support for the bill.

Inter-ethnic Strife Discussed

LD1502214190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continue to relay the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 2029 GMT Deputy Chernyshev calls for the law to cover all facets of activity. The law should ensure the transfer from state ownership to collective and cooperative ownership.

At 2033 GMT Deputy Larionov expresses concerns of autonomous formations regarding specific provisions of the bill.

At 2038 GMT Lukyanov says the hour allowed for debate is up, and suggests that those who have also asked to speak present their proposals to the relevant commission. Several deputies come to microphones in the hall to express alternative procedural proposals. Lukyanov tries to sum up their points; then, more deputies make additional points on whether and how to continue the debate. Lukyanov calls for a vote on whether to end the debate and present the speeches of those who were not called for publication: 177 for, 184 against, 28 abstentions. Lukyanov proposes continuation of discussion of this issue tomorrow.

At 2047 GMT Lukyanov calls for two deputies to speak on the first anniversary of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The first, Deputy Yakushkin, complains that nobody has accepted responsibility for the errors of the Afghan war, but thanks Gorbachev, Shevardnadze, and all those who made the decision to pull the troops out. He calls for a minute's silence in honor of those who died on Afghan soil. Deputies rise for the minute's silence.

At 2050 GMT Deputy Tsybukh of the Youth Affairs Committee calls on those involved in inter-ethnic strife to stop it and make a general appeal for good sense to triumph. He calls for the Supreme Soviet to declare 15

February a National Memory Day for the Afghan anniversary. Lukyanov says the issue should be put to the relevant committees. The proposal is passed without a vote.

At 2053 GMT Lukyanov makes a few procedural points on the operations of the Supreme Soviet and its committee.

At 2056 GMT Several deputies express views from the floor on these and other procedural matters. Lukyanov calls for a vote on the draft decision on the organization of Supreme Soviet work to carry out the tasks imposed by the Second Congress of People's Deputies: 375 for, nine against, 20 abstentions. The decision is declared adopted.

At 2101 GMT Lukyanov goes on to the chairmanship of two Supreme Soviet committees. Following Alekseyev's appointment as chairman of the constitutional supervision committee, he has to be relieved of the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet's legislation committee: 377 for, 14 against, 3 abstentions.

At 2104 GMT Alekseyev comes to the rostrum to propose his successor as chairman of the legislation committee. He praises the Supreme Soviet's achievements so far and thanks deputies for their support. He proposes Kalmykov, his deputy hitherto, for the post. Lukyanov proposes that the committee be renamed the Committee for Legislation and Legality, with a separate committee to be set up for the fight against crime. discussion of the division of the committees' functions is to be held some other time. A vote is taken first on the proposal of Kalmykov for chairman of the old committee: 387 for, 7 against, 7 abstentions. Kalmykov is declared chairman.

At 2110 GMT Primakov takes the floor to make a proposal for chairman of the International Affairs Committee. He proposes that Dzasokhov's chairmanship be formalized: 359 for, 19 against, 13 abstentions. Dzasokhov is declared elected.

At 2112 GMT Lukyanov declares the session closed until 1000 tomorrow. The recorded relay ends.

15 Feb Supreme Soviet Debates Reported

LD1502173990 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 15 Feb 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet which began its regular session on Wednesday, got down to discussing the second reading of the property bill today.

Last autumn the Soviet parliament approved the first reading and introduced it for a nation-wide discussion, during which over 10,000 remarks and proposals were made.

Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin submitted the bill's second reading to the Soviet parliament. He said that the bill is based on the recognition of various forms of property, their equality and rivalry.

This principle should be implemented as state policy in order to enable the country to overcome simplified ideas about one form of ownership as the best one, be it state, lease-holding or individual property.

Yuriy Kalmykov and Alexey Boyko delivered additional reports on behalf of parliamentary committees on legislation and on questions of economic reform.

They said that, while drafting the second reading, the committees also used three alternative and 39 personally-drawn bills and proposals by deputies.

Thirty deputies spoke at today's session. They submitted several amendments to the bill. The debate will continue tomorrow.

Deputies honoured the memory of those killed in the Afghan war with a minute of silence today, the first anniversary of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

The USSR Supreme Soviet committee on youth affairs proposed that February 15 be proclaimed a national memorial day. This proposal will be examined by parliamentary committees.

The legislature approved Aleksandr Dzasokhov chairman of the parliamentary committee on international affairs. He has been acting chairman since the committee was established.

Yuriy Kalmykov, a lawyer from Saratov (Volga area), was approved chairman of the committee on legislation. He replaced Sergey Alekseyev who was recently elected chairman of the USSR committee on constitutional compliance.

Abalkin Briefs Supreme Soviet on Property Law

LD1502124890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Correspondent Lyudmila Semina reports from the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on USSR Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin's remarks on draft property law—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Semina] [passage omitted] Here is the concept of the proposed draft USSR law on property:

[Abalkin] In its design, spirit and content, this law can be regarded as a law for the radical restructuring of Soviet society. It is aimed at the radical renewal of the most deeply set bases of Soviet society's economic foundation, and it can be boldly asserted that such a profound, radical and comprehensive renewal of the whole system of ownership relationships in the country has never been drawn up over the whole 72 years of the existence of the Soviet state. None of the preceding reforms—and there have been plenty of them throughout our history—set the task of such radical and profound changes. I think it is only when we have resolved these issues which touch upon the structural bases of our society that we will be able to successfully progress both in the area of economic reform and in the country's political reform, because given all the importance of the latter, in many ways it is defined by the changes in society's economic foundation as an instrument of the superstructure.

I would also like to stress that the fundamental tenet of the draft complies with the platform: On Humane and Democratic Socialism, which was approved by the CPSU Central Committee February 1990 plenum. Second, the draft law proceeds from an acknlowledgement of the natural diversity of forms of ownership, of their equality, and of their healthy rivalry and competition. I would like to stress the fundamental importance of the tenet on the natural diversity of forms of ownership, precisely. Here we must finally overcome many ingrained stereotypes and oversimplified ideas which depict only one form of ownership as the leading, main, and best one in comparison to all others.

We have achieved no small degree of success in criticizing former ideas when one form—the state form to be precise—of social ownership was regarded as the only logical socialist one and was superior to all others. These ideas have evidently now been outlived. However, we must accept that the reverse process is now unfolding—a kind of inverted dogmatism—when it is no longer the state form but some other one of the great diversity of forms which is again making a claim to the role of the ideal and the best one at all times and in all conditions. I think that...incidentally, this form might be promoted today in various variants—leasehold ownership, individual ownership, or some other variants of it. But the main thing is that the draft proceeds from a recognition of the natural coexistence and simultaneous functioning of the most diverse forms.

Another particularity of the law consists in the fact that, while it provides a description of the main structural elements of ownership, it leaves this list open without attempting to decide beforehand and to predetermine the possibility of new forms of ownership taking shape within the context of this system which would comply with the general constitutional principles and would not fall beyond the conditions which are determined by this law. Proceeding from this understanding, the law envisages conditions ensuring the equality and equal protection of each form. It must be clearly understood that this must be consistently observed with regard to any form and, to an equal degree, must be conducted as state policy.

I would like to stress that by adopting these decisions we create the conditions for a consistent transfer to an efficient planned market economy and for the economic freedom of citizens, while safeguarding a real choice by workers of the forms and methods of applying their abilities, a guarantee of their interests and the rights of consumers. [passage omitted]

Dismisses Referendum on Law

LD1502234290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1804 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Remarks by Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin at the 15 February Supreme Soviet session in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] Two materials have arrived, including a note from Deputy Moshnyaga. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, I urgently request you to answer the two underlined questions—an appeal to USSR people's deputies, a supplement on one sheet—the Block of Patriotic Forces of the City of Moscow [as heard]. You see, Anatoliy Ivanovich sent me just such a note.

Well, you have probably read these works. You see, here there is something on a future paradise—the deputy has simply underlined two phrases. The first: well, there is, after all, an alternative to this madness, there is a concept of cost reduction [protivozatratnost] in economic operation which in one or two years will lead the fatherland out of crisis without social traumas and without unemployment and starvation.

Well, I am forced, I sometimes follow some of these publications and I have not found such a type of concept. They are slogans and the customary appeals.

The second thing underlined: To hand over the adoption of the law on ownership to a referendum by the whole people. If you ask my attitude, I think that we are not ready for this on a number of counts.

Firstly: A referendum presupposes an answer—yes or no. It is not appropriate in another sense.

Secondly: the concepts which are frequently employed—and this has been revealed in a sociological study—are used in a completely different everyday perception. Well, then, you see, there are scientific concepts and there are everyday concepts. When you say that this person is a materialist in the scientific sense, he is an adherent of a progressive materialist worldview, but in everyday life, if he is a materialist, then he is a bad person.

Therefore we have demonstrated that when a person is asked how do you relate to private ownership, can there be private ownership? He says, of course, everyone can have a car or a dacha. But, you see, he is not being asked about this. And, finally, the third point. We must bear in mind that in critical periods, periods of revolutionary transformations, the opinion of the majority can be conservative.

If, in 1921, the question of a transfer to a new Economic Policy had been posed at a referendum of the whole people or the whole party, then you can imagine what the majority would have voted for. It is not such a simple question.

I think, and we talked about this at the last session, the deputy is authorized by his electors to express their will and to express it professionally. [passage omitted: brief answers to other questions handed to him]

On Nature of Ownership

LD1502234190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1606 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Speech by economist Leonid Abalkin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, at the 15 February session of the USSR Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted providing history of the work that has gone into the proposed draft ownership so far] Even given the formal exclusion of exploitation of man by man, the bureaucratization of ownership relations, and the formation of administrative-command structures can—and we know this in practice—indeed lead to the worker and the labor collective being alienated from the means of production, power, and management. Any forms of such alienation are incompatible with socialist society, and stand for its deformation and for a deviation of the traits and characteristics inherent in it.

Only the situation, the real situation, in which a worker, a labor collective, and the working classes of society as a whole, acquire not a formal legal but a real right to be the master in the country, in production, in society, and in the state, can serve as a reliable criterion of progressiveness and of the socialist nature of the forms of ownership involved. In connection with this it is proposed to introduce some more precise definitions into the preamble of the law to reflect this aspect of the problem, too. [passage omitted on the issue of hired labor; various meanings of hired labor analysed; history of the term, which can mean, inoffensively, inclusion of the worker in the process of public labor, but the term labor contract tends to be preferred; many difficulties could be avoided by giving leagl recognition to the worker's right to apply his labor as he wishes, independently, or on the basis of a labor contract; possible ownership structures listed; in the west, cooperative, leasehold, joint-stock ownership classed as a variety of private ownership while in the USSR that term is avoided and one speaks of collective ownership the concept of private ownership has a long history that cannot be ignored]

The draft law recognizes, allows, and defends the citizen's ownership of the means of production. These are fairly precisely designated in the law. There is a broad spectrum of means of production that can be owned by a citizen, a peasant, or personal subsidiary holding or a labor holding [trudovoye khozyaystvo]. This understanding of the matter is fully in accord with the concept developed by the party in determining the long-term outlook for our country's development. The platform I have already mentioned, Toward a Humane Democratic Socialism, contains the following thesis: The CPSU considers that the presence of individual labor ownership [trudovaya individualnaya sobstvennost], including such ownership of the means of production, does not conflict with the current stage of the economic development of our country.

I think conceptual precision should at the same time give sufficient legislative powers for the introduction of these, of this economic activity.

What is new is that, unlike the previous draft which was discussed earlier and which was approved in the first reading, this one has a special added article, Article 11, not previously included. It is connected with the current trends taking place in society and provides for forming citizens' ownership of houses and apartments, with full owner's powers, i.e., the right to dispose of that apartment, bequeath it, and so on. Also designated are the sources from which this ownership may be derived, in addition to the fact that we already have individual home ownership today.

The conditions and sources by which this ownership is obtained, besides what we already have—we have individual ownership of houses today—have also been designated. It arises in two cases: either fully by means of the payment of share contributions by citizens who are members of a housing, housebuilding, dacha, garage, or other cooperative, or by means of the purchase of the apartment or house in question from the owner, the state, including one from the state and public housing stock.

With regard to personal ownership, there is one more, rather complex issue, which has, we feel, been solved in a fairly clear legislative form in this draft. This concerns the sources of citizens' property. These sources of citizens' property are described in Article 7 of the law. It is envisioned that citizens' property is created and increased through their labor income from participation in public production, the arrangement of their own affairs, revenue from funds invested in credit institutions, shares and other securities, and the acquisition of property by inheritance and other grounds permitted by legislation. This norm enshrines both the realities of our economic life which already exist, particularly the increase of personal property through interest on money deposited in the savings bank, and the newly developing processes connected with the issue of shares, including labor- related ones, and in the future, of other securities, particularly loan documents, which are now starting to be issued. The authors of the draft, in providing this interpretation of the matter, proceed on the premise that these types of revenue from financial savings and shares are founded on labor. [passage omitted: background generalities on how the USSR is now accepting economic concepts that used to appear alien but are actually common to all economies; recollections of economic reform conference of last November which supported this view]

Now for the rich collection of collective forms of ownership. There is a fairly diverse range here. I have already said that there are five varieties of this form. Some of them are regulated by special laws. We are dealing with collective ownership, lease relations, on which special legislation already exists, the prospects for the adoption of special legislative acts on the use of the share form, although this is not always so pure, because leasing, if taken in its simplest form, does not change ownership relations and is not a form of ownership. Leasing is a new type of management, a new, progressive form of management, not connected, in principle, with changes in ownership relations. [passage omitted: more theoretical background on this; statement that collective and cooperative forms are kept separate in the draft, with background generalities on the difference]

I would like to dwell more thoroughly on various aspects of state ownership. Recently it is, specifically, the state form of ownership that has come into the firing line for criticism and has begun to be regarded as the economic basis and foundation of the administrative and command system, which needs to be destroyed just as fully as the administrative-command system itself. These approaches forget that the formation of such large social structures as state ownership are not a concocted idea or the result of cabinet deliberation and the imposition of its will on objective life; it is, above all, a reflection of the objective processes of taking production into public ownership. This form also exists, and on a fairly wide scale, in many developed countries of the West, for all the democratic character of their life and dominance of market structures, and it does not impede their functioning. There is also an effect from the fact that there was quite often a confusion, an identification, of the mechanisms for the functioning of state ownership and its perverted, deformed structures with the objective content of this process. The real problem lies in the need for profound renewal, radical renewal, and consistent democratization of state ownership in the direction of ensuring that it at last gains its real owner and that there is no featureless society standing behind it, but a real owner, with full rights, who has control over its property and facilities.

The whole question is how to do this, and there arises here the question of what the bill proposes, and in what direction it proposes it, to conduct the process of the renewal and democratization of state ownership. I would single out here several fundamental provisions, of which there are probably three main ones.

The first, and very major, step in this direction is connected with the actual formation of a three-part, three-level structure of state ownership, which I have already mentioned: that means union ownership, ownership by union and autonomous republics and local ownership. This is the economic foundation of economic independence and self-management at all levels, beginning with the local soviet and ending with the union republic, or if you like, the other way around. Ownership is here brought as close as possible to the immediate interests of people and social groups of the population and to the conditions of their everyday activity, and there appears a real opportunity to control, manage, and regulate the mechanism for the use of these facilities. That is the first principal advance.

The second. The second is concerned with lending the labor collective working on these facilities, facilities of state ownership, real powers in using them and making, or progressing as far as possible to make every labor collective and worker really their own master. [passage omitted on Article 25 of the law, which says that state property that is assigned to a state enterprise belongs to it on a basis of entitlement of full economic management, which in many respects approaches ownership rights]

Statewide property localized within the framework of an enterprise, acquires its real master, but that's not the end of it. There is one more area, a third element which is tied in here, in which a big step forward is taken. This is Article 26, which envisions that at a state enterprise, without changing the nature of these ownership relations, the part of the profit that after taxes and other payments remains at the disposal of state enterprises is transferred into the ownership of the members of the labor collective. Each worker of a state enterprise becomes a master, possessing a certain share of the common collectivized property, with the right to manage this share and to receive an income from it.

What is the importance of this? I think that this is of colossal importance, which above all consists in the fact that such a mechanism puts state property on an equal footing with cooperative, leasing, share property, and all other forms of ownership, and provides it with the basis for equal competition between them in the search for the most effective ways and methods of managing a business. We are getting an opportunity to prove our viability in the process of competition. The remainder is decided by the open economic process and by this competition itself.

There is one more question, which is connected with the fact that, as a whole, the adoption of this law and its implementation in practice can entail a fairly broad, large-scale process—it is unclear whether it will be rapid or comparatively slow—of the denationalization of property [razogosudarstvleniye sobstvennosti] and of he transfer of much, and possibly, a growing amount of state property which will be transferred from state ownership to some other forms of ownership.

We must already, now without waiting for the process to gather strength, foresee beforehand, calculate a few steps ahead the possible consequences of such actions, to learn the necessary lessons, which are also connected with implementing this process. [passage omitted detailing the need to learn from the mistakes made by a number of Eastern European countries which have taken the road of denationalization, one mistake being the plundering or the squandering of state property, which cannot be allowed; forestall proposals to this end; Abalkin refers to an indistinct clause regarding setting up the appropriate bodies to implement the management and regulation of the use of state property holdings, saying that these holdings must be protected from possible misappropriation]

How management and regulation of the use of state property holdings will be determined, and who will determine it depends on the level of ownership. It will be a republic or the local soviet who decides who is invested with planary powers. When dealing with All-Union property this function is to be handed over to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will manage and must manage these property relations.

The last question which, perhaps, has given rise to the keenest debate and for which it has not been possible to find a final decision by virtue of a whole host of reasons, is connected with the ownership of land and natural resources. [passage omitted outlining these reasons which include republican territorial sovereignty, questions concerning the utilization of land, economic forms connected with how these lands are sold and how in the final analysis appropriates its revenues]

We have settled on postponing a final resolution of the matter until problems of the federal state structure of the USSR have been settled and on recording at that point [dannom sluchaye] the state status [gosudarstvennaya prinadlezhnost] of this property. [passage omitted]

'Heated Debate' in Supreme Soviet Session Noted

LD1502192490 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Excerpts] The regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet worked for the second day in Moscow on Thursday. Our parliamentary correspondent reports:

After the session opened on Wednesday parliamentarians discussed an agenda and proceeded at once to consider a number of important bills of which more than 20 were attached priority significance. They agreed to begin with debates of a draft law on property as the one expected to largely determine prospects of national economic and political developments and the future of the nation in general. [passage omitted: Abalkin quoted presenting a revised version of the draft law]

Naturally enough, heated debate flared up over the proposed draft. Industrial workers deputy, Leonid Sukhov, said he would vote against it as one creating opportunities for transferring the socialist economy to the interests of Mafia-controlled shadow economy dealers who've been flourishing in recent years.

Another industrial worker and MP [member of parliament], Viktor Fominykh, welcomed the new draft as one paving the way for efficient economic practices and hence for filling the empty domestic market with goods. Dr. Anatoliy Denisov, an economist, censured what he described as term juggling in the context of the draft. He said that instead of describing private property euphemistically as individuals' property acquired through work, it would be more expedient to abandon dogmatic stereotypes and call a spade a spade. He said the nation was faced with the dilemma of whether to build an efficient economy on the basis of various and equally legal property forms and break out of the crisis, or to remain crisis stricken but continue playing with terms.

Many MPs called attention to a discrepancy between the draft under discussion and that of local self-government. Considerable differences made themselves felt in the course of debates over the ownership of natural resources. It is still unclear whether these should be treated as a national asset or an asset of the republic or autonomous region where they belong. Most speakers urged the Parliament to pass the draft law which the nation badly needs.

Further on Property Debate, Abalkin

LD1502111490 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT 15 Feb 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin has presented to deputies a new version of the property bill.

The draft, he said, proceeds from the recognition of the diversity of forms of property, their equal and competitive nature. This principle, Abalkin said, should be upheld as state policy, destroying the simplified view of one form of ownership as the best one-state, leaseholding or individual.

The bill lays down the provision that various forms of socialist ownership form the basis of the Soviet socioeconomic system. It stands firm however on the inadmissibility of the exploitation of man by man.

The bill allows ownership by individuals, collectives, state and variants thereof. A special section deals with the legal status of ownership of joint ventures, foreign citizens, organisations and states.

Abalkin noted that it was decided not to include the term "private property" in the new version, because it is unequivocal from the scientific point of view. Moreover, society has a negative attitude to the term "private property". At the same time the bill allows ownership by citizens of some capital goods. For example, a farmer can own a tractor and other agricultural equipment.

The speaker did not agree with press attacks on state ownership made in the course of the discussion. He said it is required but in a radically renovated form. The bill provides for a three-tier structure of state ownership: All-Union, republican and communal.

During work on the new version of the bill, consensus was not reached on all positions. The deputy prime minister said there was no agreement on who should own land and natural resources: the union or republics. It is suggested that the issue be put off until after the problems of the Soviet federation are solved and write into the law only that land and its resources "Belong to people living on a given territory".

The deputy prime minister called on the deputies to consider this urgent issue in a balanced and careful way so as not to disrupt the frail balance between many points of view that has been reached in the course of prolonged preparatory work.

A heated discussion began in the Soviet parliament today on a property bill submitted by Leonid Abalkin. The debate was bound to be critical after First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov suggested that deputies speak only about those items of the bill with which they did not agree. A five-minute time limit permitted 16 deputies to take the floor at the morning sitting.

As was expected, opinions clashed most strongly over the forms of property. Leonid Sukhov, a driver from Kharkov, in the Ukraine, believes that the bill proposes "the legalisation of private property." In his opinion, a law like this one will further worsen the economic situation of ordinary people. He demanded a nationwide referendum on the bill.

He was supported by Vavil Nosov, a machine operator from the Komi Autonomous Republic. He fears that if the selling and purchasing of land is allowed, land will be purchased by those who acquired money illegally.

Nosov was opposed by another worker, Vladimir Yudin from Magadan. He believes that the main meaning of the bill is to enable those who work honestly and hard to improve their living conditions.

Deputy Aleksandr Korshunov from Tashkent believes that it is too late to discuss the feasibility of private property, because it already exists in the country. He said that the most important thing was not to restrict the number of property forms, but to pursue a correct taxation policy. He was supported by Aleksandr Orlov, rector of a trade union school from Chelyabinsk, the Urals region, who said that not enough attention was devoted in the bill to taxation.

Most speakers opposed the holding of a referendum on the property issue.

The discussion of the bill is continuing.

Boyko Addresses Supreme Soviet on Economic Reform

LD1502222990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1738 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Speech by Aleksey Nikolayevich Boyko, chairman of the Subcommittee on Questions of Ownership, on behalf of the Committee for Issues of Economic Reform, at the 15 February Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin—from the recorded relay]

[Excerpt] Esteemed comrade deputies, the procedure of the discussion has unfortunately turned out in such a way that by my own presence at this rostrum I must recall which committee was the source of the very concept and structure of this draft law.

I have come to this rostrum not only to comment on the alterations made in the published version of the draft but also to reply and react to the many utterances by scholars and working people who, as has already been said here, have sent us thousands or, if one includes verbal utterances, tens of thousands of various proposals. At the same time, in this connection, it is necessary first of all to react not to the positive remarks—and even more so to those which we have taken into consideration—but rather to those who categorically reject this draft.

On my way to this session I received in the course of my job this petition. It is not the only one and, therefore, I consider that I should cite it here as this is an aspect of politics and we cannot ignore these nuances. I quote: If one casts aside all the various terminological contrivances, what is being prepared is, in the fullest and most exact meaning of the words, a counter- revolutionary, anti-socialist action, and it should be spoken of precisely as such, without allowing it to be camouflaged as a routine legislative process. There you are—routine—no more, no less. You see, here are such reactions, too.

I believe that these citizens are quite sincerely worried. But at the same time, one cannot, of course, in any event, share this attempt to play the Pope to the public and engage in this sticking of labels literally in the sense that the deputies dream of how to seize power from the working class. A very interesting view but, as the saying goes, let it be on the conscience of the writers. [passage omitted: Boyko answers specific non-controversial questions]

Supreme Soviet Honors Memory of Afghanistan Dead

LD1602093190 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin.

Deputies of the Soviet parliament honoured the memory of those killed in Afghanistan with a minute of silence today.

Today, on the first anniversary of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country, Valeriy Tsybukh, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Youth

Affairs, proposed to make February 15 a national memory day. On the proposal of First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov, deputies submitted the issue to Supreme Soviet committees.

Deputy Viktor Yakushkin, a young teacher from the city of Vitebsk, who spoke on this issue, expressed gratitude to Mikhail Gorbachev and other leaders of the country for the courageous decision to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

Political & Social

Zaykov on February Central Committee Plenum

LD1502210390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] The CPSU continues to be devoted to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism, creatively interpreting them, of course, and taking account of the realities of the present-day world. There are every grounds to hope the Soviet people will support the political orientation of the CPSU Central Committee's platform for the 28th Congress of the party. This was stressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, when he spoke today at a meeting with representatives of the working people of the Mikoyan Machine-building works in Moscow. This collective, which produces the famous MiG'S, worthily represents the intellectual potential of the Soviet aircraft-building industry and the talent and skilled hands of our working class.

In the party committee and workshops of the enterprise there were lively and businesslike discussions about the progress of perestroyka in the party and in society. They were continued at the meeting with representatives of the collective.

We are living in a difficult and dramatic period, the secretary of the CPSU noted. An important event has been the February plenum of the Central Committee. The debate at the plenum was very heated and diametrically opposed viewpoints were manifested, but the overwhelming majority made constructive and profoundly well-founded proposals. Its draft platform accords in the main with the expectations of Soviet people and will make it possible to eliminate the lagging of the party behind the restructuring processes in society. In its significance for the destinies of the country and the world this document must become in effect an up-to-date manifesto for the party.

Much was said by the participants of the meeting about the great political and economic importance of conversion. An impermissible delay was noted in the preparation of a government program for it. One must not take an oversimplified attitude toward the task of transferring production to a civilian footing and expect an immediate and universal abundance from it. Conversion must be carried out in a well-thought-out and organized way and combined with economic measures for the social protection of the production and scientific collectives employed on defense.

Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov answered questions from the communists and workers of the enterprise.

Formulation of Presidential System Reported

LD1602114190 Moscow World Service in Russian 1040 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Report from INTERFAX correspondent]

[Text] The Soviet presidential system will be of the French type. There will be a head of government in the USSR alongside the president. This was said to an INTERFAX correspondent by Yuriy Kalmykov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order.

The Soviet president will have the right to carry out general leadership of the activity of the government. He will be able to require a report about the activity of any member of the government, or to demand his dismissal. Yuriy Kalmykov also said that the formulation of the USSR presidential system, in which a special commission of jurists is engaged, will be completed within two weeks.

Constitution Commission Head on Gorbachev's Powers

LD1102222590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television in Russian at 1530 GMT on 11 February in its "Seven Days" program presented by Aleksandr Krutov, carries a 5-minute interview with Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, chairman of the committee for the supervision of the constitution, by Krutov.

Alekseyev participated in the CPSU Central Committee plenum, and Krutov asks him what he thought of the party's platform: "You know, I have mixed impressions," replies Alekseyev, "this is an uneven document. In places it is very bold and decisive, and in places there is repetition and stereotype phrases. But all in all it is a major, significant document. It seems to me that it anticipates the programme of a party of renewed socialism."

When asked whether presidential power and rule is so necessary to the Soviet Union, or whether the old structures can be maintained, Alekseyev says: "I consider that president power is important for the strength and unity of the state. A president embodies the integrity and strength of the state. But look at what our chairman of the Supreme Soviet has turned into—let him forgive me for these words. He is essentially, well, the leading speaker at the Supreme Soviet." He is the "chairman of the session, as Krutov suggest and Alekseyev agrees: "He has carried out a ceremonial function but he has held considerable power from the point of view of apparatus; yet externally, was he able to resolve any situations of conflict in the country, as all presidents, everyone who holds that power, is able to do?"

Krutov then asks, "As he is both general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Supreme Soviet, does Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev not hold absolute power anyway?" "The reverse, in fact," replies Alekseyev, "it seems that he holds absolute power, yet in essence he cannot resolve any major domestic issues. He cannot lift the blockade of the railways, he cannot resolve any other situations of conflict. What sort of absolute power is this? And where have we seen it? Incidentally, in terms of his internal makeup, Mikhail Sergeyevich—and you have opportunities to have contact with him—somehow does not accept it, he is internally unreceptive to it [absolute power], so to speak. However, that is the personality side of the matter, but I am talking about the fundamental, official side of it. On the contrary, I am sometimes amazed that he has no power. It is necessary to go to the Presidium in order to resolve an elementary issue which is resolved very simply by the head of state in other modern states."

The main event at the plenum was political pluralism, Alekseyev continues; the plenum passed through this "dramatic culminating point" in its work "with honor." The party and Gorbachev "revealed political development along the right lines, on a promising course," he considers. "The plenum went further. It did not only annul Article 6; it is essentially affirming the start of political pluralism, a multiparty system in the country."

Editor On Gorbachev, Independence

LD1502143090 Vilnius GIMTASIS KRASTAS in Lithuanian No 3, 19-25 Jan 90 p 3

[Commentary by Chief Editor Algimantas Cekuolis in the Week Section]

[Text] The flooding of Nemunas and Dauguva Rivers was, of course, not the result of ice melted by the hot political climate in Lithuania. It could have been, however. A sufficient amount of heat had been generated.

Did a political thaw occur, though?

The honored guest saw Lithuania and our determination. He saw correct behavior almost everywhere and was also shown that no one is into boot licking. He beheld our strong stand: total state independence and, of course, an independent Lithuanian Communist Party (LCP). This was stated by workers, young people, kolkhoz [collective farm] workers, the intelligentsia, and functionaries. He saw (oh, yes) the huge assembly in the center of Vilnius and he heard our silence and our bells.

A psychological breakthrough occurred, already on the first day at the Press Building, when our guest inquired, half-jokingly: "Don't tell me you would like to leave the USSR?" "Yes, yes, yes!"—resounded throughout the hall. His face and the tone of his voice changed.

What did the honored guest offer us?

He mentioned a draft for restructuring the USSR into a federation and a draft law, under consideration, for a procedure to use by republics leaving the USSR. Foreign journalists have seized upon it like a major news item. We have regarded it somewhat more quietly.

Both drafts greatly lack specifics. We are familiar with one federation—the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. It is of no interest. What do they have in mind? A British Commonwealth? A European Common Market? One could consider such things.

A "divorce law" does not pertain to us, at all. In order to obtain a divorce, one must first be married. We did not marry the USSR, but were forced to join it, by Hitler and Stalin. Other considerations are of no lesser importance. Only a nation itself has the right to decide, by way of a referendum or elections, on how it wishes to live and when and by what means it desires to join or to leave. No neighbor, no matter how powerful, can decide for another nation. This international right and principle have been acknowledged by our guest on several occasions. This most sacred right of every nation and the condition for its historical survival can not be discussed.

Things are simple, as far as the economic questions are concerned.

Authorized, equal commissions of the two states will sit down at a table. I think we will be glad to contine producing for Russia, what we have been producing previously and we will be happy to continue buying from the USSR that which we have been buying. It is well that the guest raised the subject of debts. Many enterprises have long since bought themselves out. Moreover, we also have another, very lengthy list of debts owed Lithuania. It commences with 1940.

In return for these two unclarified plans, the honored guest proposed for us to renege on our independence demands and the already achieved LCP independence. To put it politely, the proposal not only fails to provide a basis for negotiation, but even one for conversation.

We are not going to fly off somewhere, leaving the Baltic coastline behind us and neither are we a nation of political hooligans.

We must admit, as far as the start of serious talks is concerned, there exists a problem of trust. It needs to be resolved on a priority basis. Our guest does possess a phenomenal memory, indeed. However, nations have a good memory, too. We can not forget Czarist occupation and the press prohibition by Muravyev. We can not forget 1939-40 and 14 Jun 1941. Every sixth Lithuanian citizen has suffered or has perished because of Stalinism, which at that time, was also referred to as Soviet Government. Not even the name has been changed. We were not the ones perpetrating all that.

To foster trust, concrete, universally clear, and nonambiguous actions are necessary, rather than beautiful words or promises, or even personal sincerity, that do not suffice. Those actions should comprise:

1. Declaration of the Baltics as a demilitarized zone, with an actual timetable for troop removal. Sweden and NATO are not preparing an attack on the USSR and it has currently come to light, they had never planned such an attack. It is a good thing, that the guest mentioned that the Baltic military installations amount to an investment of R35 billion (?). Apparently, most of it is comprised of movable inventory. The thinking is correct. It is possible to save even additional billions, that are being expended on supporting such gigantic forces. What about the wonderful effect such an international move would have?

2. Turning over, even now, 100 percent of Lithuania's economy to Lithuania. This is not a gift, but rather, an initial step toward justice. Sovereignty without banks, transport, communications and principal enterprises is—fiction.

3. A formal declaration by the USSR Government, stating that every USSR nation has the right to self-determination, with the self-determination mechanism selected by the lawfully elected Supreme Soviet and none other.

4. We are issued constant assertions to the effect, we must not "demand too much"—that might anger Russian conservatives and they might unseat the leader, or else "toss" him into a decorative post. Perhaps it is so, but perhaps the danger is somewhat exaggerated.

USSR can not remain forever a hostage of reactionaries, however. We will not create an atmosphere of trust that way and restructuring itself will continue to skid further.

Both questions can be resolved by announcing new, directly democratic elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, following the principle of one vote to one individual, and by transferring the entire government to it. The people will decide whether that will apply to Lithuania, but the USSR will continue to be bogged down without government by the people. One can reach agreement on a first try, with democratically-elected deputies—with Moscow, a small part of the Ukraine, Leningrad and others. Never—with those representing the caste or those who have elected themselves. This type of new parliament and its prestige will serve as a barrier against parliamentary upheavals and as a means of restructuring, if the desire for it is sincere. Please accept this as a sincere proposal from a Soviet deputy.

If political determination, needed to carry out these four steps which can create an atmosphere of trust and truly tear down the party [partokratijos] dictatorship, proves to be lacking, there remains no other path for Lithuania, but to see to its own affairs. To proclaim and implement independence. Such is our duty and we can not escape from it. We are told: "It will be difficult for you." Perhaps. However, are thjings easy now? The mistakes will be ours and the search and the discovery will be—ours. "You and your children will be impoverished." Perhaps. Impoverished like the children of Finland, which has no resources, are.

The fact itself and the procedure will be decided by the Supreme Soviet majority to be elected on 24 February. They will have to carry out our election mandate.

I propose to designate Thursday, 12 July 1990, as that festive day. Municipal elections will also have taken place by then reaffirming the nation's will once more. This will provide us with time to prepare for it. We will remind Russia and the world, of the agreement and the unequivocal words prepared by Lenin, signed 70 years ago and to date unrepudiated. We will remind them of our determination and Russia's obligation to abide by it.

Miners Discuss Meeting With Gorbachev

904F0079A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 4 Feb 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Let Us Stick Up for Perestroyka"]

[Text] Immediately following the meeting on 2 February with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, a group of miners of the country's main groups of coal fields visited the editorial offices of the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. The frank discussion in the CPSU Central Committee was continued at our "roundtable".

The miners spoke of their satisfaction with the practical results of the meeting and the candid exchange of opinions. Serious questions of the progress of political reform in the country, the restructuring processes in the party and the state, and the contradictions in the election campaign for the soviets were discussed. Here are the opinions of some of the participants in the meeting.

V. Oksen, tunneler of the Mine imeni Leninskogo Komsomola Ukrainy, Pavlograd:

We were told that the maximum of an hour had been allotted for this meeting—Mikhail Sergeyevich's time was limited. But we talked for three and a half hours. I liked particularly the fact that the leader of the state deemed it necessary to meet with us and listen to us. I personally derived much that was useful from this discussion and learned of the specific measures for leading the country out of the crisis and an improvement in the entire situation. Specifically, I was satisfied by the news that there will in the very near future be a fundamental renewal of the party and that the party's monopoly in economic matters will be lifted. Also surprising is the fact that I will participate in the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, although I myself am not a party member.

V. Smolenskikh, mining foreman of the Mine imeni Kostenko of the "Karagandaugol" Production Association and secretary of the oblast workers strike committee:

At a difficult, I would say critical, moment Gorbachev found time for a meeting with representatives of the country's workers movement. We came to the meeting from all the coal regions on our own initiative and were not specially prepared either by the party or economic authorities locally, as is usually the case. As a result the head of the party and the state received the most exhaustive information, without embellishment, on the situation in the workers' environment and on the people's mood prior to the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

I personally told Mikhail Sergeyevich about the Karaganda miners' attitude toward the nuclear testing at the Semipalatinsk range. Owing to the radiation contamination of the environment, the atmosphere in the region is at fever pitch. A warning about the announcement of a general strike if there is another explosion was heard in the miners' demands on the party authorities. Gorbachev listened to me attentively and assured me that the range would be closed.

I believe that both the leader of the party and us workers will benefit greatly from this meeting. Nothing was left unsaid between us.

L. Krivenda, miner at the face of the Mine imeni 60-Letiya Leninskogo Komsomola, Zverevo, Rostov Oblast:

All plenums take place mainly under the stamp of secrecy, and, aside from dry accounts in the papers, we know nothing about them. But here, just imagine, we had Mikhail Sergeyevich consenting to the participation in the plenum of 10 persons from our miners' delegation. And they will have a vote, what is more. And whereas the representatives of the local party authorities usually, having attended such plenums, subsequently talk about them from a parochial standpoint, we have been afforded an opportunity to see everything with our own eyes and to recount this ourselves in the labor collectives. I believe that this plenum will be pivotal to some extent. Now is not the time to be talking to no purpose....

N. Pastukhov, excavator operator of the "Yakutugol" Production Association:

Previously, representatives of industrial outfits, meeting with the country's leadership, would pull up the bedclothes over themselves, as a rule, and act the part of supplicants. On this occasion the discussion was about the political situation in the country. We pondered not who we were but what our lives would be like henceforth. The main question today is about power. It is really held not by the soviets, not by the government, and not by the Politburo but by the stockholders. The State Planning Committee, for example, as the leader of a savage tribe, is in charge of the allocation of all that is produced. We told Gorbachev: It was not you and not we who created these structures, so let us be more decisive in changing them.

I am sure that at meetings with the people from my parts the primary problem—concerning confidence in the party—will surface. The upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum is very important. I hope it will be the first at which the voice of the rank and file party member is heard.

Sh. Sheykhakhamedov, miner of the "Yuzhnaya" Mine (Vorkuta) and member of the city's strike committee:

My main impression? It was the first time in our history, possibly, that there was a blunt, candid dialogue between the head of the state and the party with empowered representatives of the worker environment nominated by the action-committee route. And it was a question of the topic of the day—the policy and fate of the state. Our opinions did not coincide in all things or at once, but we heard from Gorbachev his profound devotion to the cause of the revival of a healthy workers movement in the country. We told him that we workers would lend our support to the radical wing in the CPSU and the Central Committee which consistently advocates a renewal of the party and opposes the conservative forces. We have no other way.

A full account of the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA "roundtable" meeting will be published in a coming issue.

Orthodox Leaders Cable Gorbachev on 'Disputes'

LD0202133990 Moscow TASS in English 2233 GMT 1 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All RUssia, as well as other hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church who met in Moscow on January 30 and 31, signed a telegram to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev asking him to "help put an immediate end to acts of violence and lawlessness perpetrated by uniate extremists and free captured temples in order to settle disputes in relations between Orthdox believers and Catholics of eastern rites in western Ukraine on the basis of law, with due account of the interests of both sides without any discrimination and with respect for accords worked out as a result of talks between the Moscow Patriarchate and the Roman Catholic Church."

This was announced by Archbishop Kyrill of Smolensk and Kaliningrad at a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the Department of External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate on Thursday.

The journalists were told that the hierarchs had discussed the situation in the Russian Orthodox Church in connection with the aggravation of inter-ethnic and inter-faith relations in some regions of the Soviet Union. They were familiarised with the recommendations worked out as a result of talks between the delegations of the Russian Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches.

It was noted that the text of the recommendations, earlier approved by the Holy Synod and Pope John Paul II, was unanimously endorsed by the Assembly of Hierarchs.

The news conference was told that the assembly discussed matters relating to the government of the church and decided that the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate should henceforth be officially called the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the Belorussian Exarchate—the Belorussian Orthodox Church. Each of these churches should have a synod of five ruling hierarchs instituted.

It was also decided to abolish foreign exarchates of the Russian Orthodox Church while retaining all foreign eparchies and subordinating them directly to Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia and the Holy Synod. The list of foreign eparchies shall henceforth comprise the following: The eparchy of Argentina and South America, of Baden and Bavaria, of Berlin and Leipzig, of Brussels and Belgium, of Vienna and Austria, of The Hague and the Netherlands, of Duesseldorf, of Corsun (France) and of Surozh (Britain).

Taking into account the increased number of parishes in some regions of the Soviet Union, the assembly decided to revive the ancient eparchies of Tobolsk, Brest and Gomel.

The summary of the assembly's activity contains a call on the flock, including the clergy and laymen involved in the rift by the so-called Ukrainian Autocephalian Apostolic Orthodox Church. The assembly calls on them to "rejoin the confines of the now suffering and grieving mother-church". The assembly called on them to normalise relations between Orthodox believers and Catholics of eastern rites and the church life in the western Ukraine.

Members of the synod of the Russian Orthodox Church and representatives of the clergy who have arrived from west Ukrainian eparchies responded to questions asked by journalists at the news conference.

Biryukov: Ligachev, Gorbachev 'Working Together'

PM0702162090 London BBC Television Network in English 2230 GMT 6 Feb 90

[Interview with Dmitriy Biryukov, political editor of OGONEK, in Moscow, by news presenter Donald MacCormick in London on 6 February, on the BBC 2 "Newsnight" program—recorded]

[Text] [MacCormick] Earlier today I spoke to Dmitriy Biryukov, the political editor of the liberal magazine, OGONEK, which has championed many of the reforms proposed by Mr. Gorbachev. In his opinion the plenum represents the last opportunity on the part of the hardliners to block the president. I asked him if Mr Gorbachev had been prepared for such strong and bitter resistance to his latest proposals.

[Biryukov] I think the...he already was ready to such opposition, and it was, well, it was expected, you know, because even in his beginning speech he put forward a very interesting and a very crucial moment which everybody was waiting for: This is a very crucial point of the possibility of the creation of the new opposition party, as far as understood.

[MacCormick] What about the role played by the arch-hardliner, Mr. Ligachev, because over here some people have reported him as being very, very critical of Mr Gorbachev today—and on the other hand, some people have been saying he actually supported Mr. Gorbachev. What do you think is actually going on there?

[Biryukov] You know, of course he will support Mr. Gorbachev because I think Mr Gorbachev is keeping him in... in the... in... so they're working together in the Politburo. This is my point of view.

[MacCormick] What has been reported here is that Mr. Gorbachev's original proposals yesterday are being... are at this moment being worked over again, so that they can be presented again tomorrow before the vote in the hope of winning more support. Now, do you think, or do you fear, that that may mean that the proposals are being watered down?

[Biryukov] It is very difficult to say correctly, but you know, we... it is the crucial moment: If his proposals will be watered down, that will mean we will go into wrong direction, to my mind. If it will remain in the main platform of the party, it will be good to the country and to the people.

[MacCormick] When you say that this is the last opportunity for the opposition to Mr. Gorbachev to beat him, do you think they actually can beat him tomorrow when they vote?

[Biryukov] It is very difficult to put forward the forecasts, because I said that this plenum is a unique plenum, and it's going on in the unique time.

[MacCormick] Yes, I know it's very difficult to forecast, but what's your guess about what's going to happen?

[Biryukov] My guess: that everything will be okay, I mean, that Gorbachev will win. You know one thing—that this plenum is an expanded plenum: There are a lot of people who are not members of the Central Committee, and judging by their statements, they are very supporting... very strongly support his program and supporting his platform. But let's leave and see.

Raisa Gorbachev's Influence Examined

PM1402164090 London DAILY EXPRESS in English 14 Feb 90 pp 16-17

[Daniel McGrory article: "Raisa, Hated Queen of All Russia"]

[Text] The latest Raisa joke echoeing around the Kremlin is that Mikhail Gorbachev was worrying how to pay the army's wages, when Raisa nobly offered to sell off her wardrobe.

The generals were very grateful, but had to give back half the money as it was far too much.

Raisa may have charmed and captivated us but she is unquestionably the most disliked woman in the Soviet Union with more enemies plotting her downfall than her husband's.

Jealousy explains a lot. Kremlin wives traditionally weigh more than their husbands and, except for funerals, they are seldom seen and never heard.

Certainly they don't behave like the Queen of All the Russias and elbow their way into private meetings to interfere and have their say.

During the Washington summit, Raisa squeezed on to the end of a love seat in an elegant salon while her husband argued with American Secretary of State George Shultz over cuts in their nuclear arsenals.

What makes it all the more galling for the Old Guard is that Gorbachev listens to her. In a rare interview with an American TV network about their life together, he indiscreetly said: "I always ask her advice. Before a speech she's my first listener. She is my general."

Not surprisingly this heretical remark was censored out when the programme was shown to Russian viewers.

The most sought-after video in Moscow is an underground offering. The Empress. There is Raisa in London, then Geneva, Paris or could it be Rome—waving and smiling and looking as elegant as ever. Except in every shot she is wearing a new dress.

Worse, is the shaky—probably fake—footage of Raisa supposedly let loose in a jewelers in Bond Street, London, with her fabled American Express card.

Not many organisations have the facilities to produce a video like this, and it proves the lengths to which her enemies will go to discredit her.

Few would dare say anything critical about her in public. Former Party Chief Boris Yeltsin did and was fired. Rumours are about the only thing in ample supply in Moscow and most of them involve Raisa. The latest is that she is his second wife and that she saw off the first.

"That's a lot of bunk," said Viktor Fomenko, a theatre director who has known Gorbachev for 25 years. "It's just malicious talk and it never seems to stop."

That said, autobiographical details about Raisa Maksimovna Titorenko are something of a state secret. The official version is that she was born in the Siberian outback at Rubtsovsk in 1934—although some rsearchers believe it was really four years before in her husband's native region near Stavropol.

She decribes her father as a railway worker, though again rumour has it he was an economic adviser to Lenin—if so, Raisa had a pampered upbringing.

Raisa does nothing to clear up the mystery. At the opening of an art exhibition, she was asked about her birthplace and said icily: "I'm a Russian woman. That is all you can say of me," and moved imperiously on.

She is so obsessively secretive that no one knows for sure how many children they have. Some say two but only their daughter—Irina, a Moscow surgeon—has been seen.

Her academic career held more attraction for her than maternity. At 55, she doesn't care to be reminded she is a grandmother. In family photographs it is always Grandad Misha who is making the bigger fuss of their granddaughters, Kseniya and Anastasiya.

By the time Raya, as Raisa is known, arrived at Moscow State University in 1950 to study, she was considerably better read and better bred than Misha, and he knew it.

They met when Misha and a couple of friends invaded a ballroom dance lesson and he rudely shoved aside Raisa's partner.

She was even more of a communist zealot than he was in those days. Some say she still is. But she shared his ambitions and encouraged Misha to claw his way through the party hierarchy.

Gorbachev's brother, Aleksandr, said: "She was his secret weapon. She boosted him to power."

Obviously she was not the sort of woman to stay in the shadows. When the Gorbachevs were sent off to the wilderness of Stavropol in 1956 so Misha could make his reputation, it was Raisa who made the money as a university lecturer.

Misha signed up for her classes and when he dared question her, caught the sharp edge of her tongue as did the KGB who eavesdropped on her lessons and were suitably chastised by the fearless Raisa.

The Gorbachevs despised the orgiastic excesses of men like Brezhnev, and earned a reputation for being prudes.

They preferred to spend their time reading poetry to each other or going to the ballet and the theatre rather than going to drunken dacha parties.

Historian Zhores Medvedev said: "They are immensely loyal to each other. When she had an appendicitis operation, he disappeared from Moscow to look after her in their country dacha which ironically sparked rumours that he was seriously ill."

Raisa is fiercely protective of him. She watches his diet because of his diabetes, and apparently encourages him to take radon baths and drink carbon spring water to stabilise his blood pressure.

She modelled him—from the hand-made Italian suits to tutoring him on how to lose his country accent and to speak slower.

She is evidently a woman of style and has completely redecorated their various residencies with pale, Scandanavian furniture, Afghan rugs, and paintings by artists who were jailed by her husband's predecessors.

Her appetite for shopping is the stuff of legend, though she is now more discreet in Moscow. She slips out in her armour-plated Chaika with her bodyguard and heads for the All-Union Fashion House where her patronage of designer Vyacheslav Zaytsev has made his work sought after in the West.

The party picks up the bill for everything, though the privilege she has always enjoyed most is the freedom they get to travel. Abroad, Raisa feels freer to behave as she pleases—knowing there is as much fuss made of her as of the President.

She is a striking sight, enviably trim, with high cheekbones and a wide, expressive mouth. She sees nothing wrong in flaunting her beauty. Indeed, she argues it's crucial to present Russia's new face the world—and this she has certainly done.

Gorbachev tells his Kremlin critics he wants Raisa to be a role model and encourage more women to play a part in public life. You can see her fingerprints on his speeches about womens' rights. The Soviet Constitution says women are equal, but Kremlin men ignore that—convinced, on that clause, Lenin got it horribly wrong.

Raisa would never settle for being an ornament, as the Thatchers found when they entertained the Gorbachevs to supper in Downing Street and the conversation turned to class.

In an idle aside, Gorbachev joked that in the Soviet Union they were all working class and was abruptly rebuked by his wife. After an argument lasting several minutes, he conceded Raisa was right.

She is witty, and irreverent, though she can be caustic and domineering, as Nancy Reagan found. She was accused of being insensitive in Armenia when she showed up in her furs and finery to comfort the earthquake victims.

What most Russians simply cannot understand is why she has to go everywhere he does. When Gorbachev turned up in Murmansk to review his submarine fleet, his admirals were horrified to see Raisa teetering up the gangplank behind him. Legend has it a Tsarina once boarded a warship which soon after sank with all hands, so the admirals tried in vain to block Raisa's path.

After a near mutiny by the crew, Gorbachev decommissioned the nuclear submarine which the admirals had renamed The Tartar Woman.

Paper Interviews Gorbachev's Interpreter

PM0502172490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 4, 28 Jan 90 p 11

[Interview with President Gorbachev's interpreter Pavel Palazhchenko by Natalya Davydova—no date, place given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] His face has been on front pages of the world's major newspapers and magazine covers for five years now, standing beside well-known personages. However, this man's name was recently revealed in an interview in the Soviet press and in the US "People" magazine. He is Pavel Palazhchenko, Mikhail Gorbachev's interpreter.

Q.: How does one become a president's interpreter?

A.: To put the record straight, no such position exists. My position in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is a counselor. I translate for the head of state and our foreign minister when their partners speak English. But this is only part of my duties at the section of military and political problems of disarmament of the US and Canada Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Q.: In 1985 you were 35. Before that you were a foreign language student and a simultaneous translator for five years at the UN in New York. Why were you offered the job to translate for Mikhail Gorbachev?

A.: At the time, they were looking for someone to succeed Viktor Sukhodrev. I was one among those who went through a test. I guess I passed the test.

Q.: Maybe they simply liked your background?

A.: I don't think they were interested in my biography. The important thing was my professionalism and ability to be trusted by people I interpreted for. At any rate, the most important thing is to create a normal psychological atmosphere where the main particpants in talks wouldn't feel uncomfortable because they are not sure of their interpreter.

Q.: Shortly before Gorbachev's 1987 visit to the US, the American press reported a special training session of Soviet President and his wife were given. Was it psychological preparation? Do you think this is something an interpreter needs too?

A.: I didn't hear anything about any special psychological training for Mikhail Sergeyevich and Raisa Maximovna. The pressing political events which our leader is actively involved in are the best kind of training. It's true that both, here and in America, prior to important speeches, debates, question and answer sessions, different situations are simulated and different versions of answers to questions are discussed. This is a natural part of a leader's preparation the world over. As for my psychological training, it is hard to submit myself to any kind of treatment.

Q.: Do you feel weary after talks?

A.: Very much so, although the pressure on the main participants in the talks is much greater. For example, Gorbachev's talks with Shultz on his last visit to Moscow lasted four-five hours. Whereas in the past many things used to be prepared in advance, with negotiators sometimes rubber-stamping decisions, today they really exchange views which can result in new treaties.

Q.: Do you find interpreting for Gorbachev hard?

A.: I think his is not the easiest speaker to interpret for. What Gorbachev says requires precise translation as a rule, his ideas are often expressed in striking forms. His speeches are rather emotional.

Q.: Viktor Sukhodrev interpreted for many Soviet leaders, and it wasn't plain sailing with some of them. In his recent reminiscences in the magazine "Ogonek" he said that Voroshilov treated interpreters worse than orderlies.

A.: Never once did I see either our foreign minister or Mikhail Sergeyevich mad with their interpreter. They are respectful—I'm not looked at as a piece of furniture, but as someone doing an important job.

Q.: Incidentally, Sukhodrev lived in the same house in Kutuzovskiy Prospekt where Brezhnev lived. Do you live near Gorbachev?

A.: I don't know where Gorbachev lives. I live in a five-story house on the outskirts of Moscow.

Q.: What's your pay and your per diem during summit talks?

A.: When on foreign trips I'm paid 25 dollars a day, the same as everyone.

Q.: Did you change your view of Gorbachev after you met him in person?

A.: I wouldn't say my attitude or our head of state is determined by the fact that I work with him. I am impressed by the fact that as a politician he is unusually open.

Q.: Whenever you are on TV with Gorbachev, we see several tall athletic and very alert men nearby. How are your relations with the presidential bodyguards?

A.: They are very civilized. I think they're reasonably unobtrusive. We quickly reached a mutual understanding.

Q.: Do unexpected situations arise during talks?

A.: You can't think of everything. Who could foresee the storm off Malta? the Maksim Gorkiy saved the day. Someone later made a crack that the summit took place on the 'basis of socialist realism'. True, the joke wasn't in the papers. The event was too serious and important for that.

Q.: We aren't spoilt by what they report in the West. I mean, no one there would be surprised reading about their country's top executive, his or her hobbies, children, grandchildren...

A.: Americans report such things, as a rule, with a great deal of tact. The US President's wife is always greatly respected and American women always rank her as the most popular woman. She has her own personnel. We don't have such things, to my knowledge. The First American Lady is involved in various projects—charitable and public, as a rule. She is much in the news. I think the situation can change here only if reporters show some initiative.

Q.: You, for example, don't meet the press willingly. In the past few years when glasnost was only picking up, you explained that your Western counterparts too were usually reticent. How about today?

A.: I don't think my interviews are successful. I feel awkward in a celebrity's role. Remember what Pasternak used to say? "Being a celebrity is tasteless." These are more than just words for me.

Moscow Poll on Political, Economic Reforms

18120110A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 2 21-28 Jan 90 p 9

[Text] The Policy is correct but change should be faster. This view is held by 71 percent of Muscovites.

At the end of last year Moscow's Center of Political and Sociological Studies led by Igor Mintusov conducted a survey among 922 Moscow residents regarding perestroyka in the USSR. This was in response to requests from the French newspaper "L'Expansion" and France-Inter radio. The persons polled come from all strata of the population. The results of the poll have been made available in the USSR especially to MN.

1. Do you think that in the last 3-4 years the Soviet Union's economic position has become:

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. better	4	4	4	3	5	2	1	4
2. worse	82	81	82	78	82	86	84	80
3. unchanged	11	12	11	15	9	10	11	13
4. undecided	3	3	3	4	4	2	4	3

2. Has your own position in recent 3-4 years:

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. improved	24	25	23	28	29	25	18	16
2. worsened	33	33	32	28	29	36	38	36
3. remained unchanged	41	41	42	43	40	37	42	47
4. undecided	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	1

3. Which of the following statements on perestroika would you subscribe to?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. The policy is right, it should be pursued at the present stage...	17	17	18	16	16	14	15	28
2. The policy is wrong. We must go back to our previous politics...	5	3	6	4	4	6	4	4
3. The policy is right but changes should be made faster...	71	74	68	72	74	72	73	59
4. undecided	7	6	8	8	6	8	8	9

4. What's your reaction to such words as: "competition",

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. positive	74	82	67	86	78	75	69	54
2. negative	10	8	13	7	9	12	12	14
3. undecided	16	10	20	7	13	13	19	32

5. "profit",

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. positive	53	60	47	62	55	56	43	41
2. negative	28	23	32	24	28	29	34	25
3. undecided	19	17	21	14	17	15	23	34

6. "plan",

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. positive	42	38	45	40	35	39	49	55
2. negative	42	48	37	48	51	44	31	25
3. undecided	16	14	18	12	14	17	20	20

7. "socialism",

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over60
1. positive	61	59	63	51	58	58	67	77
2. negative	17	19	16	24	18	16	13	12
3. undecided	22	22	21	25	24	26	20	11

8. "communism",

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. positive	37	34	39	32	37	26	37	55
2. negative	30	29	30	32	33	35	29	17
3. undecided	33	37	31	36	30	39	34	28

9. "capitalism"?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	-50-59	over 60
1. positive	34	35	33	45	34	36	31	19
2. negative	38	35	40	32	35	29	43	57
3. undecided	28	30	27	23	31	35	26	24

10. Should the Soviet Union oppose an East European country pulling out of the CMEA?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. yes	15	15	15	9	12	12	23	23
2. no	76	79	73	84	80	81	68	58
3.undecided	8	6	12	7	8	7	9	19

11. Should the Soviet Union oppose an East European country deciding on a Western model of economic development?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. yes	11	11	11	7	9	9	16	15
2. no	80	84	77	84	85	86	75	64
3. undecided	9	5	12	9	6	5	9	21

12. Should the Soviet Union oppose an East European country withdrawing from the Warsaw Pact?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. yes	23	23	23	18	22	18	29	33
2. no	64	69	60	70	69	71	58	46
3. undecided	13	8	17	12	9	11	13	21

13. Do you agree it should be possible for individual to set up and own enterprises in the Soviet Union?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. yes	57	61	54	72	66	56	47	33

2. no	31	29	32	20	26	32	36	50
3. undecided	12	10	14	8	8	12	17	17

14. Do you agree it should be possible to organize independent trade unions in the USSR?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. yes	69	73	67	75	77	74	66	48
2. no	17	17	18	13	14	12	20	32
3. undecided	14	10	15	12	9	14	14	30

15. Do you think Gorbachev's policy will succeed during the next five years?

				age groups				
	total	men	women	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 60
1. yes	26	25	29	18	20	29	29	48
2. more yes than no	31	31	31	34	33	28	30	25
3. more no than yes	19	20	18	26	21	18	15	11
4. no	14	15	13	16	14	16	13	8
5. other answers	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	-
6. undecided	9	8	8	4	11	7	12	8

Tajikistan Situation

Dushanbe Radio Reports on Tajikistan Situation

Area 'Returning to Normal'

LD1502185590 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1430 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Excerpts] The press center reports: After the shocks caused by the tragic events on 12 to 14 February, Dushanbe seems to be returning to normal. Opposition is growing everywhere to the hooligan thugs. As we were informed by the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs, worker militias and self-defense detachments are being set up for assistance to the law enforcement officers and soldiers of internal troop subunits.

There were rumors that a large number of people were heading toward Dushanbe from Leninskiy, Gissarskiy, and Ordzhonikidzebadskiy rayons. For some reason there are rumors being spread about a large number of buses allegedly sent from Kurgan-Tyube to Dushanbe to evacuate students from the capital's higher educational establishments, where classes were interrupted. We were told at the city commandant's office, there has been nothing of the sort. The situation in Dushanbe and around it has been taken under control by people from the party, local soviets, and the public. All reports are put together here, at the (?headquarters) where they are checked for reliability. For example it was clearly established that on 14 February a crowd of almost 600 people surrounded the building of the party committee of Frunzeskiy Rayon. Former internationalist troops came out to hold talks with the gathering. They calmed the excited people and convinced them to disperse.

Yesterday morning a meeting was held in the square near the government building with about 1,000 people participating. The meeting was peaceful and without any extremist attacks. Questions of lifting the curfew and forces' withdrawal from the city were raised. Participants of the meeting demanded that people guilty of pogroms, arson, and robbery be identified and made liable. Complaints are reaching the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee about unsatisfactory work in bakery shops. The press center referred these claims to Katayev, Tajikistan's minister of trade. He said on 14 February 130 tonnes of bread and buns were sold.

The tragic events that took place in the capital of the republic are still yielding wretched results in all sectors. The damage inflicted by them is expressed not only in pogroms against buildings and shops; we were told at the republic's Ministry of Health that since the beginning of the events 565 have referred to medical establishments and 178 people have been hospitalized. There are losses of life, too, including five militia workers. In drug stores stocks of the most essential medicines are running out.

We asked Yakubov, minister of motor transport, about why transport is working so badly. On the afternoon of 15 February 70 buses and 35 microtaxis were working on city roads. The situation of trolly buses is worse. As far as I know, he said, 30 of the city's trolley buses were damaged or were completely destroyed. We had losses, too. Some 127 buses, 41 microtaxis and 35 taxis were destroyed. One taxi was completely burned. I think that within the next two days, the work of public transport will be normalized. As you see, the situation is improving in the capital. Law and order are being restored. Activities of trade centers, medical establishments, transport, and other services are getting back to normal.

Party Officials Appeal for Order

LD1502130590 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] This is Dushanbe. The press center reports. At the microphone are senior officials of the Tajik communist party Central Committee (Mirza Olimov) and (Konstantin Nikolayev).

[(Nikolayev)] Dear comrades, today the situation in the city [words indistinct]. On 14 February the situation in Dushanbe remained (?extremely) complex. By day there were masses of people on the streets (?of the capital). [passage indistinct] 39 people applied for medical help with wounds of varying degrees of gravity. Seven people were killed, four with firearms and three with other weapons. [passage indistinct] By night the curfew was violated by 20 people.

Cases of pogroms in apartments which allegedly took place in the 46th, 61st and [number indistinct] rayons were not confirmed. There was a small rally in Ordzhonikidzeabad. In the other areas of the republic [words indistinct] there were no violations of public order.

At [word indistinct] enterprises workers' volunteer militias are being set up to ensure order in production and to defend installations of the national economy. Self-defense groups have been set up in residential areas and at mahallah committees.

Comrades, we call on you to join the struggle to (?restore) public order on the streets and squares of the city, and also to give assistance to the law enforcement organs and to the workers' volunteer militia.

Esteemed comrades, we shall keep you informed as news comes in.

'Special Broadcast,' Appeal to People

NC1502120890

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik at 0600 GMT on 15 February carried a special broadcast "from the studio," attended by the heads of the "Republic's Party and government: Kakhar Makhkamovich Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee; Gaibnazar Pallayevich Pallayev, chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet Presidium; Izatullo Khayeyevich Khayeyev, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers; and Boris Karlovich Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Party Control Committee." Two people were then heard speaking in Tajik on the "people's participation in restoring law and order" and "the issues stemming from the situation."

An unidentified speaker then introduced Makhkamov, who "will give information on (?events) in Dushanbe." Makhkamov spoke in Russian, with sentence by sentence translation into Tajik. In his speech, he referred frequently to the "security of workers," "the unfortunate situation," "the leadership's efforts to seek a solution for the problems," and efforts to restore normal operations of public transport and enterprises. He referred to the recent Tajik Communist Party special plenum and its decisions, saying: "The plenum expressed its full support for the bureau and leaders of the republic." He also referred to "a meeting of the Dushanbe city party committee aktiv held late yesterday evening, which was attended by Central Committee members who are in town, at which the communists of the city once more proudly (?proclaimed) their support for the republic's leadership."

He continued: "I believe that at this moment every individual, every leader, great or small, bears a huge responsibility to ensure that not even one more drop of blood is shed in the republic," and "to assist in seeking a solution to the situation that has arisen, which is acceptable to the people."

He added: "I hope that the Tajikistan Republic (?becomes) stronger" and that " the situation that has arisen can be tackled accordingly."

At 0815 GMT the station then carries what is apparently an appeal to the people to "desist from bloodshed," "ask your dear offspring, your brothers to desist." The appeal continued: "Is this the sensible path? No. Everyone knows it is not."

Moscow Newspapers Update Tajikistan Events

Dushanbe 'Tense,' Information Scarce

PM1602103390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Situation in Dushanbe"]

[Text] The situation in the capital of Tajikistan remains tense. It was announced at the temporary USSR Internal Affairs Ministry press center that self-defense detachments are being formed in the city's residential districts. Self-defense detachments have clashed with extremist groups in various districts.

An interim committee comprising representatives of various public organizations has been set up. It is headed by B. Karimov, first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. At yesterday evening's talks with the republic's leadership the committee demanded: The resignation of the first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee; the proclamation of days of mourning on 15, 16, and 17 February; the protection of the most important facilities in the city by the army and the forces of law and order, together with members of informal organizations. A protocol signed at the talks takes account of all the committee's demands. It was broadcast on republic radio. B. Karimov made a televised appeal for an end to the riots and for reason and wisdom to prevail.

It was announced in the republic that K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party, G. Pallayev, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, and I. Khayeyev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, had resigned. But this morning republic leaders said on television that until the organs that entrusted them with power actually release them, they have no right to quit at such a difficult time for the republic. B.K. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, also spoke on television.

"I think that all change must take place by legal means," he emphasized. "Only the republic's Supreme Soviet can resolve the question of the Supreme Soviet chairman and Council of Ministers chairman. Only the republic Communist Party Central Committee can resolve the question of its first secretary."

Around 5,000 militia officers and troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry internal forces and the army have been brought in to ensure the protection of law and order and the safety of citizens.

In connection with the tragic events in the republic's capital, the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium declared 15, 16, and 17 February days of mourning.

At a midday rally in the city center there were calls to resolutely rebuff the extremists. It has been estimated that there were around 1,500 people present. There were also demands for the government's resignation.

An extraordinary joint plenum of the republic Communist Party Central Committee and Dushanbe Tajik Communist Party City Committee has opened.

Unfortunately, a number of communications departments and practically all newspaper kiosks are not operating, which means that information is scarce. Newspapers are mainly being distributed in enterprises.

It is a gratifying fact that ambulances have begun to answer calls. Some 70 buses are in operation. Foodstores are open.

Situation Called 'Extremely Grave'

PM1502165390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Aleksandr Karpov report: "Anxious Situation"]

[Text] Dushanbe—The situation in the Tajik capital remained extremely grave 14 February. The republic Communist Party Central Committee extraordinary plenum's demand on the need to take the most resolute measures to normalize the situation has not been implemented. Despite the state of emergency and curfew imposed, there were pogroms, violence, and robbery in the city: The mass disorders have switched mainly to residential districts. Clashes between citizens' self-defense detachments, which have been set up everywhere in response to the government's appeal, and groups of rampaging hooligan extremists were accompanied by the use of guns and bladed weapons. Barricades appeared around apartment blocks and in narrow streets. Law and order protection organs have virtually lost control of the situation and were unable to ensure citizens' safety or counter the criminal actions of large gangs. An enormous number of telephone subscribers were cut off because local exchanges [podstantsiya] were overloaded. Disorders in the streets paralyzed business transport. In particular, the residents of Dushanbe did not receive their newspapers today because the local and central newspapers printed that night could not be shipped from the printing press. In the stores the supply of bread and dairy products has begun to be disrupted. The city commandant's office has received extremely conflicting information on the state of affairs.

There were large rallies all day long in the city center in front of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee building and on Lenin square. The newly organized "Vaadad" ("Unity") people's committee has stated that the republic's present government is incapable of resolving the population's vitally important problems and has demanded that the top leaders of the Tajik Communist Party, Council of Ministers, and Supreme Soviet Presidium resign, that the state of emergency and the curfew be lifted, and that a day of mourning be declared for the victims of the mass disorders. The "Vaadad" committee is headed by B. Karimov, the present deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee in the republic.

To prevent bloodshed in the streets and protect the lives of totally innocent people, K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee; I. Khayeyev, chairman of the Council of Ministers; and G. Pallayev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium; have resigned. After lengthy talks with leaders of the "Vaadad" committee, an agreement was reached that questions of the present leadership's powers will be resolved lawfully—at the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Plenum and Supreme Soviet session which are due in the near future. For their part, the "Vaadad" leaders have stated that they will do everything in their power to ensure that the situation in Dushanbe and the republic is stabilized as soon as possible.

Speaking on Tajik television in the evening, B. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, who is in Dushanbe, stressed the extraordinary nature of the decision taken by the republic's leadership and expressed the hope that

Tajik communists and all the people of this hapless region will view this action sympathetically and fittingly....

Fifteen people have died so far this week during the mass clashes and disorders in the city and hundreds of seriously injured people have been hospitalized in Dushanbe. The anxious situation goes on.

14 Feb Confrontations Described

PM1502131190 Moscow TRUD in Russian
15 Feb 90 p 4

[Own correspondent V. Zakhvatov report under the "We Report the Details" rubric: "Situation Still Tense"]

[Text] On the night of 13-14 February groups of excited young people, frequently under the influence of drink or drugs, continued their attacks on the streets of Dushanbe even with the advent of the curfew. Gangs (you cannot call them anything else) of louts armed with bars, cudgels, and chains drove around in "requisitioned" trucks. This is what Igor Sh.—one of the people injured that evening—said:

"We went to work as usual in the morning—I work in a construction cooperative building housing in Gissarskiy Rayon, which suffered in the earthquake. Toward lunchtime rumors reached us of the complex situation in the city and we took the scheduled bus to Dushanbe. Hooligans barred the bus' path in residential district No. 33 and demanded that everyone except the Tajiks get out of the bus. Then they began to beat us with iron bars and kick us."

This is what I was told by Tajik Radio director Olim Zarobek, one of the leaders of the "Rastokhez" informal association:

"When the disturbances and pogroms began, I stood up for the guys and girls who were being beaten up, but then I too was beaten up...."

I would point out that there could have been fewer victims and pogroms. I draw this conclusion because I was in the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee building at midnight and saw hundreds of "special-purpose troops" and internal troops maintaining perimeter defense there. Many "special-purpose troops" were sleeping right in the carpeted corridors. At that time pogroms were under way in the residential areas on the outskirts of the city and there was no one there to defend people. However, the soldiers are under their commanders' orders....

Here are the facts as of the morning of 14 February (there are simply no later figures): According to some figures approximately 5,000 young people were involved in the disturbances. Some 24 stores, including two jewelry stores and three savings bank branches, were looted; 19 consumer service outlets, three canteens, dozens of newspaper and trading kiosks and parks, six administrative buildings, two movie-theaters, and a long-distance telephone center were damaged; and 31 ambulances were put out of action. Many ambulance medics were beaten up. Dozens of fires occurred in the city.

It proved impossible to find out—either at the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] or at the military's headquarters—the approximate number of destroyed and stolen automobiles or looted apartments.... I know that some religious zealots or just plain extremists have attacked Tajik women for failing to wear a headscarf or a satin shawl or for having short hair....

The inhabitants of residential districts began to organize self-defense detachments. After all, there was a rumor that the military had no intention of getting mixed up in a purely "civil" conflict and that this did not come within the army's field of activity. The Soviet Army in Dushanbe has hitherto only guarded government buildings, military facilities, and cantonments. Virtually all officers' families have been taken into the military cantonment and are being guarded by the troops. But, we wonder, can the officers be blamed for that? After all, they are only carrying out orders....

So, self-defense detachments have appeared spontaneously and are operating virtually independently of the authorities and MVD troops. Here is a characteristic example described by Zafar O., a resident of the "Giprozemgorodok" residential district:

"When we saw that virtually no one could defend us, we formed a detachment of approximately 150 people—Tajiks, Russians, Tatars, Uzbeks, Germans, and other nationalities. When bandits with cudgels and other hardware infiltrated the residential district in the afternoon we stood opposite one another—side by side. We stood like that for two hours."

The crowds of louts immediately retreated and dispersed when they met the inhabitants' organized resistance. Moreover, the admonitions uttered by elderly Tajiks to persuade the "demonstrators" to eschew violence and bloodshed helped.

By midday 14 February crowds had once again filled Lenin Boulevard and the streets around the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee building. The "demonstrators'" leaders demanded that the Communist Party Central Committee first secretary burn his party card right there in front of them. The mob carried on regardless, in the knowledge that the internal troop soldiers had no orders to fire.

Major General M. Navzhuvanov, military commandant of the city and minister of internal affairs, issued a warning on all radio channels that the militia and internal troops would act in accordance with the laws of the state of emergency if the rampaging crowds did not disperse and the pogroms continued. Combat helicopters began to hover over the city. Combat vehicles and armored personnel carriers drove through the streets.

The city has a difficult and restless night ahead.

Dushanbe 'Relatively Calm' After Rally

PM1602101290 Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Feb 90 p 4

[Own correspondent V. Zakhvatov report under the rubric "We Report the Details": "Dushanbe Yesterday"]

[Excerpt] 15 Feb—[passage omitted] Last night, in an emergency broadcast on Tajik Television, the republic's leaders, K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, G. Pallayev, chairman of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, and I. Khayeyev, chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers, stated that they are prepared to satisfy one of the "demonstrators'" main demands and resign, if that step will help to end the fratricidal bloodshed. After this broadcast, Tajik Television showed a talk: Otakhon Latifi, deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers, introduced a group of people as the newly created leadership of the Tajik People's Front. They included representatives of the associations "Ru Ba Ru" [as transliterated] ("Face to Face") and "Rostakhez" [as transliterated], who continued to assert that these informal organizations are not involved in the unauthorized rallies and excesses. They said that on the day when shots rang out in the square in front of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee building, the people in the square were not drunken, rampaging thugs, but the worthiest representatives of Tajikistan's young people. They said that they stood there unarmed in the face of hundreds of militiamen and internal troops, and only asked for the republic leaders to come out and talk with them. The poet Bozor Sobir, who took part in the television program, said he is proud that among these decent and honest young people were three sons of his.

They said that the participants in the rally did not shoot, and the dozens of militiamen who received gunshot and other wounds must have shot themselves....

Once again I remember last night's events.

When it was announced on television that the republican leaders intend to resign and that the People's Front committee is taking upon itself the problem of stabilizing the situation in Dushanbe, then, to put it bluntly, an outright panic began. Especially since the statements by the republican leaders were made in Tajik and Russian, while the interview with the "Committee of Seventeen" was given without any translation into Russian.

At the time I was at the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], which was surrounded by infantry combat vehicles and armored carriers. Assault troops stood sentry on every floor. Telephones screamed from the control panel in the duty room. Later a militia officer who had not slept for two nights was to show me, with the log in his hands, that approximately 90-95 percent of the calls and alarms were false alarms—due to fear. But at the time, the duty room did not have a single operations group free. And so the command was issued for all the senior MVD officers to assemble in the foyer of the ground floor—they were the only ones left in the building except for the sentries.

I listened to a conversation between two lieutenant colonels who were running to the foyer in helmets, carrying shields: "A crowd of militants is approaching the MVD building to storm it...."

This warning of an armed attack on the MVD building was also false, or a provocation. But what if it had been true? How would the fighting have ended? After all, there was no order to open fire, and none of the majors or even colonels wanted to end up in court in the event of their opening fire.

Finally—the picture that has imprinted itself on my memory this evening.

Combat helicopters circle above the city. After a large rally where the slogans were "Tajiks and Russians are brothers!", "No to extremism," and "Everyone needs peace," the city became relatively calm.

Leaders Resign To Prevent Bloodshed

PM1602101190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 90 p 1

[Correspondents A. Ganelin and A. Mursaliyev dispatch: "Dushanbe, 15 February"]

[Text] Yesterday produced the minutes of a joint sitting of the republic's leadership with a people's committee elected by rally participants. K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, G. Pallayev, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, and I. Khayeyev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, agreed to submit their resignation according to the CPSU Statutes and the republic's Constitution. It was also decided to procliam 15, 16, and 17 February days of mourning.

The text of the report was read out on Tajik television late at night. This was followed by an address by K. Makhkamov, who attributed his agreement to resign to his desire to prevent the further deterioration of events.

But a meeting of the city party and economic aktiv, attended by members of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee who are in the city, appraised the actions of Makhkamov, Pallayev, and Khayeyev as contrary to the decisions made at the extraordinary Tajik Communist Party Central Committee plenum. It was noted "that such measures do not reflect the mood of CPSU members and of the overwhelming mass of Dushanbe's residents in this complex and dramatic period."

We already announced the death of a journalist in our report yesterday. He has been identified as N. Matrosov, deputy leader of a "Lentelefilm" filming group which was here to make the movie "Afghan Breakdown"

[Afganskiy Izlom]. V. Ivashchenko, photographic correspondent of KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, has been hospitalized in a serious condition.

Some 39 persons have been hospitalized in the last 24 hours with injuries of varying severity. They included 12 with gunshot wounds. There were seven deaths—four caused by firearms, three by nonfirearms. One of the dead was a militia staffer. Sundry rumors are circulating about the deaths of some of these people. The republic's MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] is investigating all the cases in which people have died. This investigation alone will explain the cause of citizens' deaths. As of today, the number of dead stands at 18.

Workers' companies and self-defense detachments are still being formed. The sound of brass alerts people living in apartment blocks: No, not an army bugle, but knocks on central heating pipes. Servicemen started patrolling the city 15 February.

The rally was held beneath banners calling for the leadership's resignation. The ultimatum's deadline had only a few days to run. There was a sitting of the people's committee comprising representatives of the "Rastokhez" and "Ru ba ru" informal organizations. Following this, committee members met B. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee.

...A large-scale mopping-up operation was organized today inside and outside the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee building. Glass fragments, cigarette butts, and cartridge cases were swept away. The second extraordinary plenum in two days was scheduled for 2000 hours. A rally of the male residents of the block where our correspondents' office is located will be held at 2200 hours. Let us hope that neither shots nor taps on the central heating pipes will wake us up tonight.

Moscow Radio Updates Tajikistan Developments

Internal Affairs Ministry Comments

LD1502150690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] A report from the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry press center: There was relative calm this morning in the capital of Tajikistan. Measures are being taken to normalize the situation. Bus traffic is resuming. A significant number of militia staff, and servicemen of the USSR Interior Ministry and the Soviet Army have been put into service to protect law and order and to ensure citizens' safety. The situation is under control. According to information just received, 18 people have been killed since the beginning of the events in Dushanbe, and 233 people have been wounded, including 48 militia staff, three servicemen of the interior troops, and one serviceman of the Soviet Army. A briefing was held today at the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic. Spokesmen of the Interior Ministry and of the Soviet Army replied to journalists' questions.

Tajik Communists Hold Emergency Plenum

LD1502033690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] There was an emergency plenum of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee yesterday in Dushanbe. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Communist Party of the Republic Central Committee delivered a report on the events of 11-14 February. The plenum tasked the Central Committee buro, communists, and leaders with undertaking urgent measures to introduce law and order in Dushanbe and in the Republic as a whole.

The plenum also considered it necessary and expedient to reschedule the 21st congress of the Tajikistan Communist Party and to hold it earlier, in April or May of this year.

Roundup of Events

LD1602113790 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Report by correspondents Petr Vasilyev and Leonid Zhukov in Dushanbe; (Yuriy Gusankok), USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs spokesman; (Akhmed Alimov), Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee spokesman; and (Lev Binovskiy) of the Moscow police, speak in Russian with superimposed English translation—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Large scale unrest and house-to-house attacks started last Sunday in Dushanbe, capital of Tadjikistan, a republic in Soviet Central Asia. A wave of violence swept across the city; people have been killed and wounded. Petr Vasilyev has the details:

[Vasilyev] The formal pretext for the unrest was the news of the arrival of Armenian refugees from Baku in the city. It is absolutely clear now that it was just a pretext. After the beginning of the disturbances the refugees were forgotten. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] Here is the Interior Ministry report for Thursday evening—(Yuriy Gusanok):

(Gusanok) The figures for Thursday are 18 people killed and 234 wounded. In the past 24 hours alone 40 persons with wounds and injuries were taken to hospital and given the necessary aid. The victims include both law enforcement officers and persons involved in the vandalism and attacks.

[Announcer] Now the situation is relatively calm. Public transport has resumed operation, stores have been reopened. But the police and Interior Ministry troops are patrolling the streets. Calm has now been restored. [passage omitted]

(Akhmed Alimov), spokesman for the Tajhik Communist Party Central Committee:

(Alimov) I believe the unrest is an indication of the growing struggle for power. We still have to find out who provoked the large-scale actions and how. Young people, teenagers, and criminals were involved in the vandalism. This can be considered a touchstone thrown to see the response of the authorities.

[Announcer] Speaking at the current session of the USSR parliament President Mikhail Gorbachev announced that the arrested organizers of the house-to-house attacks had been released on orders from the Tajhik minister of the interior. Why was this done?

(Alimov) This was one of the conditions of the People's Committee formed in the course of the actions. The committee promised that in exchange it will stop the unrest, rallies, and actions against the authorities. Only those not involved in crimes were released. I think the authorities made these concessions in order to defuse the situation.

[Announcer] Was there any need to call in troops of the Interior Ministry? Couldn't the republic cope with the situation itself, (Akhmed Alimov):

(Alimov) You cannot speak with the people in the language of weapons, of course but it was a forced measure. At the beginning of the unrest Dushanbe had just 600 police while the crowd of vandals consisted of over 4,000. The slogans, demands, and the actions of the crowd prove that its actions had been guided. The buildings that were attacked had been carefully selected.

[Announcer] Who stands behind the tragic developments in Dushanbe? (Yuriy Gusanok) of the Interior Ministry in Moscow:

(Gusanok) I believe that social and economic reasons lie on the surface while nationalist forces clearly stand behind the developments.

[Announcer] There've been persistent rumors in Moscow that people from the south of the country are planning a kind of a crusade against Moscow involving similar vandalism. A comment from the Moscow police:

(Lev Binovskiy) There have been no concrete facts, no specific threats. Someone is inspiring such rumors, that's for sure. I know of some violations of law and order in Moscow on people from the Transcaucasus but I have heard nothing of a crusade.

[Announcer] Our reporter in Dushanbe, Leonid Zhukov, had this to say about the People's Committee set up during the large-scale unrest and conducting talks with the authorities:

[Zhukov] The committee was formed on Tuesday during a rally outside the building of the Central Committee of the communist party. It consists of 17 persons—artists, clergymen, and representatives of other sections of the population. It is led by (Buriy Karimov), chairman of the State Planning Committee. The People's Committee is not the only political organization that has appeared in the republic during the period of unrest.

There is also a parallel structure that has assumed the responsibility of controlling the observation of the understandings between the authorities and the protestors. The political situation in the republic is extremely complicated and we'll still have to find out who is who. But it is absolutely clear that the first explanation for the unrest, the arrival of Armenian refugees from Baku in the republic, is groundless. The actual cause is the desire of extremists and separatists to fan public dissatisfaction with the authorities and provoke the use of force against the dissatisfied masses.

Meanwhile it has been reported that the Tajik Communist Party leader Kakhar Makhkamov, the republic's president, Gaibnazar Pallayev, and the prime minister, Izatullo Khayeyev have decided to step down. This was announced after their talks with representatives of the (Vadad) People's Committee. But the final decision will be pased by the extraordinary Central Committee plenum and session of the republic's parliament which are to be held in a few days time. For their part the (Vadad) leadership said they would try to cool down the passions and emotions in Tajhikistan in order to normalize the situation there.

Situation 'Remains Tense,' 'Alarming'

LD1502172290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 90

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Now to something which has been particularly alarming these last few days, the situation in Dushanbe. Alas, for the time being, alarming news is coming in. The situation remains tense. Servicemen are guarding administrative buildings. In various rayons, self-defense detachments have been created for protection from pogrom organizers. But, there is not enough bread in the city, and hooligans are stopping and robbing vehicles which are delivering bread to trade points. generally, the majority of food shops are closed. The telephone system is working poorly. Many urban dwellers are unable to get to work due to lack of transport, due to street blockages, and finally due to the threats of the extremists. Here is one more exceptionally unpleasant piece of news: Crowds of extremists routed the republican hospital.

TASS Continues Reportage of Tajikistan Events

Leaders Reportedly Tender Resignations

LD1502145790 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Dushanbe February 15 TASS—A mass rally was held at the central square in Dushanbe today. Demonstrators demanded the resignation of the Bureau of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee.

The rally was organised by the Provisional People's Committee, set up in Dushanbe on Wednesday. It unites the leaders of unofficial organisations and intelligentsia.

"We think that the current Tajik leadership is incapable of resolving socio-economic problems," chairman of the committee Buri Karimov told TASS. "People must wait years for good housing, and unemployment, especially among young people, is on the rise. All this took people to the square."

At the same time, Karimov condemned extremist acts committed by some groups of young people, which led to bloodshed and violence. He emphasised that all problems should be solved through political dialogue and criticised isolated nationalistic slogans.

"The administrative-bureaucratic system is our sole enemy," Karimov said.

Chief of the Tajik Comunist Party Central Committee Kakhar Makhkamov, Tajik President Gaibnazar Pallayev and Prime Minister Izatullo Khayeyev reportedly [Moscow TASS International Russian at 1400 GMT, in a similar report, states: "...as reported by competent sources"] decided to resign after meeting leaders of the Provisional Committee.

The final decision will be passed by the plenum of the Tajik party organisation and an emergency session of the Tajik Parliament, to be held soon.

So far, the situation in Dushanbe remains extremely tense. Another seven people have been killed in clashes over the past 24 hours. Thirty nine people, including one Soviet Army serviceman, were injured. Some extremists set public transport and private cars on fire.

Armed militants roam the city.

Five thousand law enforcement and Interior Ministry troops, as well as Soviet Army soldiers, are guarding government buildings, vital facilities and residential areas, according to unchecked sources.

The USSR Interior Ministry reported today that clashes between native population and self-defence units took place in some districts of Dushanbe on February 14. Seven people died there yesterday, including one militiaman. Forty people were injured. According to the Soviet Interior Ministry, a total of 18 people have died in Dushanbe during the present unrest. Some 200 people have been injured.

Public transportation has been at a standstill for the past 24 hours. Many workers did not report to work.

This afternoon about 8,000 people held an unsanctioned meeting in the streets near the building of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee. They demanded the resignation of party and local government leaders of the republic and the troop withdrawal. An unsanctioned meeting was also held outside the Presidium of the Republican Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers. It elected a committee, which urged participants in the meeting to resolve problems in a calm and peaceful way.

No progroms have been reported in the past 24 hours. A cooperative was set on fire.

Twenty four people were arrested in Dushanbe yesterday for violating the curfew.

15-17 Feb Declared Days of Mourning

LD1502153190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1439 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Dushanbe, 15 Feb (Tajikta-TASS)—By decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, 15-17 February have been declared days of mourning in connection with the tragic events in the republic's capital, which led to human casualties. A civil funeral was held yesterday in Dushanbe's central square, which was attended by more than 2,000 people.

Disturbances Appear 'Organized'

LD1502203390 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Dushanbe February 15 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

The tragic events in the Tajik capital were prompted by a sense of impunity, Major-General Mamadayez Navzhuvanov, Dushanbe's commandant, Tajikistan's interior minister, told TASS.

He said that not one of those who participated in pogroms and instigated disturbances has yet been brought to account.

"The state of emergency has been announced in Dushanbe and the curfew imposed. Some 5,000 militiamen and servicemen of the interior forces and the Army are protecting law and order and citizens' security. More army units are arriving in Dushanbe each day," he said.

"But this does not check extremists. They spread absurd rumours and provoke disturbances. Raiders wreck houses and shops, set buildings on fire, beat up people. Extremists are certain that even if they are detained, they will get away with impunity."

And how does the minister explain the fact that he ordered the release of 13 detained raiders?

The minister said he had given this order on demand of a rally on February 15. What is more, he had been given a directive which he could not defy. [Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian on 16 February carries in its second edition on page two an interview with Major General M. Navzhuvanov. The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA interview renders this exchange as follows: "...(Correspondents) You ordered the release of 15 detained thugs, did you not? "(Navzhuvanov) That was in response to a demand from those assembled at a rally 13 February. But that is not the point: An order was received which I could not fail to obey."]

He said that the identities of all these militants are known and that it will not be difficult to find them. The minister said that the actions of raiders seem to be organised. "There is coordination in actions of extremist groups. Militants are supplied with weapons, bottles with incendiary mixture and sulphuric acid. The introduction of the state of emergency and the imposition of the curfew was the only possible measure in this situation. There was no other way out. The life of people should be protected," the minister said.

The minister said that, protecting their life and dignity, residents build barricades and form emergency volunteer corps.

"Tajiks, Russians, Uzbeks, Germans and Tatars rallied against militants. Emergency volunteer corps formed of workers and soldiers who had fought in Afghanistan assist law enforcement bodies. Such corps now consist of some 50,000 people," the minister said.

The minister said a law on militia, and the rights and duties of interior forces is vitally needed.

"A paradoxical situation develops when militiamen and soldiers are fired at, pelted with stones and bottles with incendiary mixtures, stabbed with knives and hacked with axes, and are not even permitted to resort to self-defence."

The minister declined to make any forecasts for the days ahead, but said that law enforcement bodies are doing their utmost to stabilise the situation and prevent further violence.

He reproached party, Komsomol and trade union leaders of the republic and people's deputies for hiding in their offices, instead of talking to people and calling them for sanity.

"What is needed is a dialogue, not recrimination. Any matters can and must be decided at a negotiating table, and not on barricades," he said.

Meetings Open; Information Shortage Noted

LD1502210990 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Dushanbe February 15 TASS—A rally was held in the centre of Dushanbe, capital of Tajikistan, at about 12.00 today. By preliminary estimates, it was attended by some 1,500 people. Speakers at the meeting urged to give a strong rebuff to extremists. Along with it, some people demanded the resignation of the government.

An extraordinary joint plenary meeting of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee and the Dushanbe City Party Committee opened here.

Leaflets, TV and radio programmes are being used in an attempt to dispel rumours. A special issue of the city evening newspaper VECHERNY DUSHANBE was brought out dealing with the situation in the city. The newspaper gave a telephone number by which everyone can call at any time of day or night to ask any questions and to express his views or proposals on the normalisation of the situation. However, many post offices and about all news stands are closed, which creates a shortage of information. Newspapers are distributed mostly at enterprises. The city radio broadcasting network is not functioning.

It is worth mentioning positive facts: the ambulance service began to respond to calls. Seventy buses began to work at city bus lines. Grocery stores opened.

Situation Still 'Extremely Tense'

LD1602000490 Moscow TASS in English 2121 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Dushanbe February 16 TASS—The situation in the Tajik capital continues to be extremely tense. Another seven people were killed in the past 24 hours in clashes of extremist groups with law enforcement agencies and troops. Thirty nine people were injured.

According to the Soviet Interior Ministry, a total of 18 people died during the Dushanbe unrest and more than 200 were injured. Cases of the arson of public transportation vehicles and personal cars were registered. A state of emergency and a curfew were imposed on the city. At present 5,000 officers of law-enforcement agencies, Interior Ministry troops and army units are protecting government buildings, other vitally important facilities and residential areas. They are assisted by self-defence groups emerging on their own. They are made up of workers and soldier internationalists—representatives of various nationalities. The strength of the groups is several thousand.

Participants in a massive rally held on Thursday in the central square of Dushanbe demanded resignation of the whole of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee and the Republican Government. The rally was organised by the provisional people's committee set up here on Wednesday, which includes heads of informal organisations and representatives of the intelligentsia.

Buriy Karimov, leader of the provisional committee and head of the Republican Planning Committee, strongly denounced extremist actions of some young people which led to bloodshed and pogroms. He stressed that all existing problems should be resolved by means of a political dialogue. "We have one enemy—the administrative-bureaucratic system," he said.

After long talks with leaders of the provisional people's front, Kakhar Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, Gaibnazar Pallaev, president of the Tajik Supreme Soviet, and Izatullo

Khaeev, chairman of the Republican Council of Ministers, decided to resign, informed sources report. A final decision will be taken by a plenary meeting of the republican party organisation that opened here on Thursday, and an extraordinary session of the Tajik Supreme Soviet, which is planned to be held in the coming days.

Major General Mamadaez Navzhuvanov, Tajik minister of the interior and Dushanbe commandant, told TASS that extremists were spreading absurd rumours and provoking unrest.

Leaflets, TV and radio programmes are being used in an attempt to dispel rumours. A special issue of the evening city newspaper VECHERNI DUSHANBE was brought out dealing with the situation in the city. However, some post offices and about all news stands are closed, which creates deficit of information. The ambulance service began to respond to calls on Thursday. Seventy buses began to work on city bus lines. Grocery stores are working.

By the decree of the Presidium of the Tajik Supreme Soviet, February 15 to 17 were proclaimed days of mourning, following tragic developments in the republican capital that involved the loss of life.

Regional Affairs

Kirghiz Procuracy, MVD Appeal for Calm

LD1502143290 Frunze Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Now a report from the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Procuracy and MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. In the capital of the republic and some (?other) areas over the past few weeks there have been cases of possible destabilization (?of the situation). Tension has been whipped up by individual [words indistinct]. [passage indistinct] The participants indeed raised acute problems of a social and economic order, questions of migration of the population, providing jobs for young people, and fulfilling the law on state language. At meetings of labor collectives it was pointed out more than once that the Kirghiz people have never tried to inflame interethnic strife. This is shown clearly by its entire history, stretching many centuries.

The competent organs are taking resolute measures to expose those who spread rumors, to put a stop to provocative fabrications. It should be said straight out that the situation is being inflamed basically by people who are politically immature, people who are not in a position to forecast the further development of events. At present the operational situation in the republic is fully under control. The law enforcement organs have at their disposal sufficient forces and means to maintain the necessary public order. However, the recent events in Dushanbe and other regions show that mass unauthorized gatherings of people (?incited by provocateurs) can lead to tragic consequences.

In connection with this, the Kirghis SSR Procuracy and MVD appeal to the population to remain prudent and to refrain from hasty and illegal actions.

Correspondent Views Kirghizia Situation

LD1502155690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0348 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] For the next four or five minutes we shall pay a visit to events which, to our dismay, have begun to repeat themselves. Everyone remembers the January crisis in Baku where even today the situation remains complex. Then tragic news arrived from yet another southern republic, from Tajikistan. Unsanctioned meetings of young people took place at the end of January and beginning of February in Kirghizia, too. What is the situation like there now? We asked our correspondent in Frunze, (Aleksandr Myrtov), to tell us. Hello.

[Myrtov] Good morning. Indeed, the meetings which you just spoke about were held in our city. I will add only that last Saturday, 10 February, there was yet another attempt to hold an unsanctioned meeting, but it never came off. There were no clashes or, moreover, bloodshed whatever between the young people gathered in the central square of the city and members of the law enforcement bodies. The situation was also defused to a large extent by the fact that on this day, leaders of the party and government of the republic met representatives of the city's young people and some public organizations who submitted a number of demands concerning social and cultural-amenity problems. These include matters of the registration of young men and women of indigenous nationality who arrive in the city from rural areas, and finding work and homes for them.

In this context, as was noted at the meeting, rumors to the effect that apartments and plots of land for individual building will be given to refugees from Azerbaijan are without foundation. It was precisely this gossip—there is no other word for it here—which prompted the unsanctioned January meetings in the capital of Kirghizia.

Today, the city's life is proceeding in its normal working rhythm, and there are no external signs of a destablization of the situation. But, all the same, there are still not a few rumors and conjectures.

Alongside me here in the studio is (Feliks Sharshenbayevich Kulov), first deputy minister of internal affairs of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. Well, (Feliks Sharshenbayevich), what is the situation like today?

[(Kulov)] Well, as you said Aleksandr, there are not a few rumors and conjectures. But speaking about the state of affairs in the republic today as refracted through the prism of events in Dushanbe, I state in all responsibility that a criminal explosion of that kind will not take place in the republic. There are no grounds for that. What basis is there for such a categorical assertion, and why do I link the city of Dushanbe in here?

Well, I have in front of me KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA of 13 February. Here on the first page, under the general, garish headline "An Echo of Baku," two correspondents reports from Frunze and Dushanbe are published together. Well, I can say nothing about the verisimilitude of the remarks about Dushanbe of course, but I believe that a gross inaccuracy has been permitted in the report about the city of Frunze. I have in mind the words that allegedly, in our republic, I quote, nationalist calls have begun to be heard. First, this has not been the case in reality. Second, as the author, that is, the correspondent of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for Kirghizia, (Babelinov), has reported, he never transmitted anything of the sort: He doesn't even have the relevant text of what he transmitted on telex. Third, the rumors about the refugees allegedly arriving from Armenia and Azerbaijan—these really did exist, but that was in January and appropriate explanations were then given about them, and those discussions never arose again, as you correctly remarked.

So, in my view, what we have here is not simply a mistake, but political insensitivity, to put it mildly, and an ill-considered treatment of the facts.

Now, as for my own categoric assertion that in our republic, mass and universal unlawful violent actions—I stress these two words—are ruled out: Why am I so sure of this ?

First, in order to carry out widescale actions such as those which have taken place in other regions of the country, a serious antisocial, anti-Soviet, nationalist organization has to be in evidence, as you understand full well. There is no such thing in the republic, and I can state that with certainty. Second, the demands which were heard at the three previous meetings— incidentally, there were not all that many people at them, somewhere around 150 to 300 active people plus three or four times that number of idlers—were not of an anti-Russian or anti-Soviet nature. There were only the social and economic matters which you correctly mentioned. Third, in predicting processes one has to proceed from an analysis and a knowledge of the character of the Kirghiz people—a respectful and generous people. The most important thing is the absence of religious fanaticism. Incidentally, the same may be said about the Russians who live here and other nationalities here in our republic.

But the question here is, are manifestations of group hooliganism possible? Unfortunately, they are not ruled out at discotheques, rock-concerts and we have had such individual incidents of this. The most important thing here, in my view, is to intercept them, basing oneself on the law, on the force of law, to show firmness and not to allow any doubts. I think that an aggressive force may, in the interests of democracy, be bridled and restrained by the force of the law and the force of authority.

Turkmen Council of Ministers Appointed

LD1202204290 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 25 Jan 90 p 1

["Decision of the Turken Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Approving the Composition of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet decides:

To approve the Turkmen SSR [TSSR] Council of Ministers with the following composition:

Akhmedov, Khan	chairman of the TSSR Council of Ministers
Charyyev, Ata	first deputy chairman of the TSSR Council of Ministers
Mogilevets, Yuriy Klimentiyevich	deputy chairman of the TSSR Council of Ministers
Annayev, Beki	deputy chairman of the TSSR Council of Ministers
Amangaldyyeva, Tuvakbibi	deputy chairman of the TSSR Council of Ministers
Rzhapov, Matkarim	deputy chairman of the TSSR Council of Ministers
Grinin, Vasiliy Antonovich	TSSR minister of internal affairs
Aliyeva, Meredgul	TSSR minister of education
Atayeva, Aksoltan Toreyevna	TSSR minister of health
Amangeldyyeva, Tuvakbibi	TSSR foreign minister
Mamiliyev, Ashirmurad	TSSR minister of culture
Muradov, Shakhargeldy Orazmukhamedovich	TSSR minister of communications
Durdyyev, Amangeldy	TSSR minister of trade
Nazarov, Ernst Kalandarovich	TSSR minister of finance
Atayev, Khalykberdi	TSSR minister of justice
Khodzhanespesov, Kurbanberdy Aidogdyyevich	TSSR minister of motor transport and roads
Atayev, Ashir	TSSR minister of consumer services
Shabasanov, Makhtumkuli Karayevich	TSSR communal amenities minister
Saparov, Redzhep	TSSR minister of local industry
Samadov, Sadardurdy	TSSR minister of light industry
Razhapov, Matkarim	Chairman of the TSSR State Planning Committee
Bagramov, Sergey Georgiyevich	Chairman of the TSSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supplies
Dzhumakuliyev, Mengli	chairman of the TSSR State Construction Committee

Alov, Nedirmamed	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for Labor and Social Provision
Rakhimov, Serdar Seiitmuradovich	chairman of the TSSR State Committee of Television and Radio Broadcasting
Bairamsakhatov, Nursakhat	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for the Press
Chorekliyev, Toily	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for Nature Protection
Shaniyazov, Aman Muradovich	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport
Klychev, Niyaz-Durdy	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision
Khanamov, Nurmukhamed	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for the Construction of Water Resources and Civil Industrial Installations for the Agroindustrial Complex
Arkhipov, Petr Mikhailovich	chairman of the TSSR Committee for State Security
Babakulyyev, Dzhorakuly	chairman of the TSSR State Agroindustrial Committee
Kanayev, Annasakhat Sakhatmuradovich	chairman of the TSSR State Committee for Safeguarding Oil Products
Kurbanov, Kim Ibragimovich	controller of TSSR Council of Ministers' Affairs

[Signed] S. Niyazov, Chairman of the TSSR Supreme Soviet
[Dated] Ashkhabad, 24 January 1990

Open Letter to Gorbachev on Caucasus

90US0502A Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 18 Jan p 2

[Open letter to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by USSR People's Deputy Zoriy Balayan—first paragraph is KOMSOMOLETS introduction]

[Text] In his open letter to the head of the Soviet state which was read at an interrupted session of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, USSR People's Deputy Zoriy Balayan made yet another attempt—prior to the bloody events in Azerbaijan—to focus the attention of the leadership and the public of our country on the events occurring in the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and all of Azerbaijan. The bloody rampage or, more precisely, the genocide of Armenians in Azerbaijan which has lasted for two years now and the attempt to solve the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh by exterminating an entire people made us doubt at one point whether the somewhat belated publication of the letter in question is feasible. However, it is now obvious that Nakhichevan, Baku, and Getashen are links of the same ominous chain which originates in Sumgait.

One does not have to be a prophet or an oracle to predict the trouble that is in store for our country. Indeed, one has to be blind in order to overlook this trouble. I know that you are literally irritated by any talk of woes, alarm, and indecision. At the same time, I understand well that for the initiator of perestroyka, as the great Sakharov called you, it is not easy to be decisive going along with everyone on everything, especially if we take into account the fact that the April waters channeled into the Augean stables of our country do not just wash away the filth which has accumulated over 70 years but at times bring down the walls of the stables and structures 1,000 years old themselves. No matter how elevated and enlightened the salvational ideas of perestroyka are in themselves we cannot be silent now seeing how they are distorted in practice, in real life. We cannot but fault you personally, as well as ourselves, those mobilized by April, for everything happening in the country. Our grateful history will give you due credit for selflessness, for the struggle against total lies with which our entire society lived for all 70 years of its Soviet biography. However, our vengeful history will not forgive the current replacement of total lies with total self-delusion. We did not say this, but our predecessors did: "There is nothing more frightening then self-delusion, there is nothing more frightening than complacent optimism." We calm ourselves through self-delusion, we frequently hide our heads in the sand convincing ourselves and our time that everything is proceeding normally. It seems to us that once our strategic goals have been set correctly we may neglect tactical tasks and the costs of the so-called current moment. While dissecting the mistakes, miscalculations, and crimes of our recent past, we altogether ignore, putting it mildly, deficiencies which occur in the course of perestroyka itself. Referring to the mistakes of the past we cite as examples specific mistakes of specific historical figures. When the light ray of glasnost highlights not only the darkness of the thirties but the blemishes on October as well it is received quite normally and quietly. However, the ray of glasnost sort of bypasses the blemishes of perestroyka itself—the mistakes of perestroyka, your mistakes which become fateful just because they are yours. This has always been the case. If the mistakes of a leader are beyond criticism, if they are not reached by the ray of glasnost, they become impossible to rectify, and their consequences become unpredictable, as was the case with Sumgait. This frightening topic has become the troublesome topic of the day for you, and not just for you. I understand well why any attempt to discuss this topic irritates you. You understand that at issue is not just the tragedy of an entire people but the shame of our state. At issue is the fact that you, and this means the state itself, did not respond to the tragedy of the Armenian people, did not offer condolences to the victims, did not evaluate politically the Sumgait genocide, did not unmask and punish the actual organizers of this organized crime. We interpret all of it as your personal mistake, a mistake of the Politburo and the Central Committee, our mistake, my mistake. Yes, also my mistake and the mistake of all of us because we did not pursue our legitimate demands with purposeful persistence. By now, we have failed many times to ensure a Nuremberg trial for the organizers of the Armenian genocide.

The consequences of Sumgait turned out to be very predictable. Let us not talk about Fergana and Novyy Uzen, Abkhazia and South Ossetia. This is another topic. Let us only say that the organizers of Sumgait, having perceived impunity—and this essentially means support—have extended the geography of genocide: Baku and Gandzak, Shusha and Kazakh, Khanlarskiy, Daskesanskiy, and Shamkhorskiy Rayons, all of Lowland Karabakh, and the entire Armenian Autonomous Republic of Nakhichevan.

It is not at all surprising that by now Nakhichevan has become a common noun symbolizing barbarity, like Sumgait. Today's newspapers are reporting unprecedented barbaric actions of Azeris on the Nakhichevan stretch of the Soviet-Iranian border. The country is gasping, the country is surprised. It is no trifle: Along 790 km, Soviet soldiers are defending the state border against domestic enemies rather than external enemies, so to speak. Now imagine that Iran would suddenly get the idea to attack the Soviet Union along the entire 790 km of the zone on the ground. You would recall that, referring to the issue of Nakhichevan rather than Karabakh, Silva Kaputikyan and I showed you a map of the region and expressed our apprehension concerning the security or, more precisely, hopelessness of the borders in view of the emerging geopolitics since, by the will of Stalin, the Armenian Nakhichevan adjacent to the border became the Azeri, that is, Turkish Nakhichevan adjacent to the border? I will not refer to the details of that meeting, as well as to the fact that on two occasions I have written to you personally about the Nakhichevan issue and what awaits us in the strategic sense in the foreseeable future. I will not refer to the fact that during a meeting with the deputies of Karabakh on 19 June 1989 I read four pages of text to you about trouble definitely coming on the border with Iran and Turkey unless you take appropriate measures. I will not do that because we may be accused of separatism though we do not have to worry about this because the number of meetings with you by both delegations is based on parity. However, I would like to cite an excerpt from the record of a meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet held on 20 October 1989. I will take this liberty because a representative of Azerbaijan was also present at this meeting: "The death of an autonomous Armenian entity, the Nakhichevan Republic, has occurred. Not a word has been said about it to this day, for 70 years, not a word anywhere, at any level. Meanwhile, everybody is well aware of how this happened. They know why this Armenian land with Armenian population was transferred to the just formed Azerbaijan SSR. They know that by now not a single Armenian is left there, not one. They know that all Christian temples, churches, tombs, and burial sites have been destroyed, and all of this before the eyes of just one generation. Why has this gone unpunished? It would appear that there are grounds and laws for retribution..." However, in your closing remarks you did not utter a word on Nakhichevan. I understand that we cannot put everything on what we are finding to be the quite frail shoulders of perestroyka. You cannot be blamed for the past a single bit. However, in this instance the future is at issue, the fate of perestroyka, the strategy for a very complex region, the fate of Armenia and the country. We have already raised the alarming topic of Nakhichevan with the leadership of country at all levels. The topic has caused bewilderment on the part of some and lack of understanding on the part of others. Yet others revealed an obvious lack of knowledge of the geographic map of our motherland. Our concern was only shared by the General Staff, but even there they threw their hands up like fatalists: Supposedly, there is nothing to be done—our strategic fathers were too shortsighted and too naive in the Bolshevik style. Supposedly, the status quo exists. Supposedly, there is no reason to worry—the sacred borders of our motherland are securely locked. Are they really?

Was it not this great power delusion sprinkled with conceited optimism that turned the myopia of the Bolsheviks into blindness? Otherwise, what seeing person would allow a bridge to be built across the Araks at the exact location which was not at all by chance acquired by Turkey from Iran, a bridge that will connect Soviet Turkey to NATO Turkey? One recalls how Andropov charged the newly appointed Politburo member Aliyev immediately after the death of Brezhnev with supervising transportation and communications in our vast country. The country waited in vain for this energetic mafioso to embark on developing communications in, say, the non-chernozem zone. Carrying out the plans of pan-Turkism, he undertook to build a road along the Araks which essentially connects Baku and Ankara. At that same time, under Aliyev, a bridge across the Araks was conceived. It is not difficult to visualize the danger this pan-Turkic endeavor poses for the country, and in particular for Armenia and Georgia. This concern for the future of the land made it imperative for me to address a deputy inquiry to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the chairman of the USSR KGB, the minister of defense, and the chief of the General Staff. The inquiry read:

"As is known, under pressure from Turkey, a part of historic Armenia—Nakhichevan—was arbitrarily included in the just formed Azerbaijan SSR by virtue of the Treaty of Moscow of 16 March 1921 without the right of transfer to a third country. At that time, Turkey had no border with Armenian Nakhichevan which soon became an autonomous republic with the majority Armenian population. Some time later, Turkey acquired from Iran a 9-km strip of borderland connecting it with Nakhichevan. Pursuing far-reaching strategic goals, the Turks secured at first that there were no Armenians and

Russians left in the Armenian Autonomous Republic, and subsequently decided to build a bridge across the Araks within this very 9-km strip in order to establish a link with the now ethnically homogeneous Nakhichevan in order to transfer arms and contraband with ease in the guise of cross-border trade.

"It is easy to surmise what the true essence and sense of erecting this bridge are in the exact spot where the country is vulnerable. There is no doubt that the bridge will serve the interests of NATO and pan-Turkism the genuine purposes of which are well-known to us.

"The bridge is being planned in the environment of extreme aggravation of interethnic relations in the region. If a bridge is needed to span the Araks it was built long ago, somewhat further upstream on the border of the Armenian SSR and Turkey. By now, an airlift has already been established between Ankara and Baku. Regular flights which are not controlled from the strategic point of view take place. Now, erecting the bridge across the river is also planned.

"I would like an explanation: Has this been authorized by the Soviet Government, endorsed by the KGB, the Ministry of Defense, and in particular the General Staff?"

Thus far, I have received a response from General of the Army M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff who leads me to understand that I should approach the USSR Council of Ministers concerning the construction of the bridge across the Araks in the Nakhichevan SSR. It turns out that its construction was coordinated with the General Staff because, as Gen. Moiseyev writes, the issue of Nakhichevan Oblast itself was resolved not only by the Treaty of Moscow of 16 March 1921 but also by the Treaty of Friendship signed by Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan on the one hand and Turkey on the other, with the participation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] on 13 October 1921 in Kars. The general even quotes Point 5 of the treaty which proclaims: "The Government of Turkey, the Government of Soviet Armenia, and the Government of Azerbaijan agree that Nakhichevan Oblast within the boundaries set forth in Appendix 3 to the current Treaty forms an autonomous territory under the protectorate of Azerbaijan."

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, the time has now come to illuminate the darkness of the archives with the aforementioned ray of glasnost and speak the total truth because you are now being cheated exactly as Lenin was 70 years ago. You should know how and why the ominous Treaty of Kars appeared which, strange as it may be, applies to this day and even provides the basis for building the strategic bridge. For two years now, they have been intimidating you with the Azeri, Angoran, Turkish factor without even suspecting that in reality there is no such factor. There is the intimidation of the center. There is a lie which makes it possible to virtually secure, directly and indirectly, permission for the use of force and banditry—in essence, hostilities. This is exactly what happened 70 years ago. This is what Narimanov, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Azerbaijan, wrote to Lenin at the time while carrying out the assignment of Turkey: "The Armenian issue is a life and death issue. If we yield on this issue the masses will not follow us. Meanwhile, a resolution of this issue in our favor makes us strong... If Moscow antagonizes the Angorans (the Turks, that is) over the Armenian issue they may rush into the embrace of England out of despair. What may happen then?" We know well what happened then. The Armenian area of Kars went to Turkey which nonetheless rushed into the embrace of the West and during the war prepared to engage the USSR while awaiting the fall of Stalingrad. Let us go back to Narimanov's letter to Lenin: "If we now give up the Turks we will not only lose our influence in the Muslim East but will open for ourselves an unheard-of Eastern front..."

The current events in Nakhichevan and the Iranian protest show that there is no such joint Muslim front. There is only Turkey with its pan-Turkish plans, aspirations, and leanings.

Then, as well as now, they said one thing from official podiums and another in secret reports. In the Declaration "To All People" Narimanov, having declared to the entire world that Karabakh and Nakhichevan are acknowledged to be an integral part of Armenia, exclaimed aloud: "Long live the fraternity and union of the workers and peasants of Soviet Armenia and Azerbaijan!" However, the ink with which the declaration was written was not yet dry by the time Narimanov wrote to Lenin: "The Armenian issue should not be a factor in negotiations with the Turkish delegation." Lenin handed this letter to Stalin asking him to distribute it to all members of the Central Committee with the classification "secret." It is well known what was subsequently done by Stalin. Intimidation, pressure, and lies did the job, as they still do now.

As a result, we now have the accomplished Armenian genocide in Nakhichevan, the state border which is paralyzed over hundreds of kilometers, and the bridge under construction through which weapons will be carried. The situation that has emerged concerns us greatly. We are also concerned about your, so to say, inadequate reaction to the incidence of barbarity. In light of it, it is hardly surprising that after the many days and nights in a row of the destruction of border fortifications and guardhouses a central newspaper is writing: "Our units are acting prudently having understood that it is extremely undesirable to allow the use of weapons." This is a truly Christmas-like and humane attitude toward the barbarians. This is happening at the time when this same central newspaper is writing in the same issue and on the same page about a provocation organized by the same barbarians: "In the course of a conflict in Stepanakert, the servicemen returned fire." So, they treat the barbarians ransacking the state border proper (5 million rubles in damage) whereas at the same time within the limit of a large blockaded and besieged city they open fire without much ado and kill a sculptor who was not carrying even a stick, to say nothing of a gun. As a provocation, they drive Meskhetian Turks through Stepanakert with a military detail escorting them. However, when we ask Minister of Defense Yazov to have the blockade lifted, to ensure the safety of the Armenian population in Shaumyanovskiy and Getashenskiy Rayons pursuant to the Constitution, the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Declaration of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies they camouflage their indecision by the syndrome of Tbilisi. Sumgait and Tbilisi, Fergana and Tbilisi, Karabakh and Tbilisi, Baku and Tbilisi, Shaumyan and Getashen and Tbilisi, Nakhichevan and Tbilisi have nothing in common just as Islam and pan-Turkism, the Muslim world and the infamous Azeri factor, Iran and Turkey have nothing in common. Everything is mixed up on purpose in order to intimidate the center and you personally on the Narimanov-Aliyev principle and insure the impunity of organized crime. Nakhichevan by means of which they now want to bring about an impasse in solving the Karabakh problem is a guarantee and a confirmation of this.

The organizers of pogroms on the state border explain their vandalism and barbarity by the refugees of Azeri nationality supposedly seeking asylum in Iran because they have nowhere to live. In this instance, I cannot but blame you. Please recall how many times you have ensured that our discussions on Karabakh and on refugees were not shown on television during the Supreme Soviet session following our speeches, including those on the issue of refugees. The public is misinformed. I am compelled to remind you that in the Nakhichevan SSR there are no refugees at all, except for the ancient Armenian village of Znaberd occupied by the Azeris, that 307,000 Armenians have left Azerbaijan and 157,000 Azeris have left Armenia, and that an absolute majority of them lost their homes after the earthquake and left the destroyed Armenia for this reason alone. Let us also recall (this was mentioned at the Supreme Soviet session) that even after the Azeri refugees took up residence in Armenian homes and apartments a surplus of over 30,000 vacated Armenian homes remains in the Azerbaijan SSR—all of this after the 700,000 of those who lost their dwellings in the earthquake were joined by 300,000 refugees, their countrymen.

Therefore, actual reasons for the barbaric provocation in Nakhichevan were different. Have you thought about the reason why hundreds of thousands of Azeris, to whom the official organs on the same principle of self-delusion refer by the essentially unsound combination of words "the extremist elements" or hazily and noncommittally as "local residents," began to ransack exactly the almost 1,000 km of the Iranian border rather than the Turkish border which is merely 9 km long? It would seem that for these local residents who consider themselves Turks it makes no sense to break through to Iran. Indeed, only Turks live in Nakhichevan. There are no Talysh there who are Persians. If you recall, at the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 20 October we produced a document in which these "local residents" renamed the Azerbaijan Republic making it the Turkish Republic—Turkish rather than Iranian. It was not Iran but Turkey that provoked Russia into creating the Treaties of Moscow and Kars. Stalin handed Nakhichevan and Karabakh over to Azerbaijan under pressure from Turkey, not Iran. Something else is at issue, you are, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you are. It is you who they want to intimidate by the fact that in real life a geographical and historical absurdity such as North and South Azerbaijan supposedly exist which are supposedly related by blood and are supposedly demanding to be unified. Supposedly, you should not mess with us. Supposedly, you, Gorbachev, should not try to resolve the Karabakh issue not in our favor. Never mind that ancient Iran, which does not acknowledge the relationship, lodged a protest with our country over the outrages on the Soviet side of the border. The protest will be forgotten, but Moscow will be fearful for a long time to come. Fear is a poor foundation for sobriety and resolve. We witnessed on the "Vremya" program a speech by CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.N. Girenko in Nakhichevan and that by R.N. Nishanov in IZVESTIYA and on television. Fear gives rise to pathological phenomena. Of course, against this pathological background, it is easy to erect on the sly the Turkish bridge through which tens if not hundreds of thousands of combat weapons, essentially NATO-Turkish weapons, will be delivered in the racket and commotion of, following the TASS terminology, yet other "unprecedented barbaric actions." The safety of the Armenian and Georgian peoples, the security of the Soviet state border require that, following everything that has happened, the issue of abolishing the Armenian Nakhichevan Republic and subsequently turning its territory over to the jurisdiction of the USSR Ministry of Defense should be referred for consideration to the Soviet parliament. After all, barbaric actions on the border have clearly shown that Nakhichevan has already become a Trojan horse for the USSR, as pan-Turkism has planned.

This, unfortunately, is the frightening truth, the truth which looks like Sumgait, the truth about trouble which we cannot fail to avert. Allowing the building of the horrible monster-bridge under the current circumstances existing means disrespect for the memory of our fathers. This means expressing no effective concern for the future of the motherland, its territorial integrity, and the life of our people, this means no respect for one's human rights. As is known, this runs counter to your principles. Recently, the magazine TIME wrote, having named you the man of the decade: "Soviet people have long become used to the leaders who lied to them. By speaking the truth, Gorbachev has shaken his fellow citizens prompting their unprecedented political activity and respect for their civil rights." However, life has shown and perestroyka has confirmed that it is not enough to speak the truth. You also have to listen to the truth, and listen attentively, to the truth about the tragedy which will definitely befall the country if, contrary to common sense, the lie still builds the bridge, to the truth that it is better to violate the laws of heavens than to anger the people.

With respect,
[Signed] Zoriy Balayan, USSR People's Deputy

Resolution Adopted on Aid for Azerbaijan Refugees

PM1502102790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Aid for Refugees. USSR Council of Ministers Adopts Resolution on Additional Measures To Aid Citizens Forced To Leave Azerbaijan SSR After 1 January 1990"]

[Text] In accordance with this resolution and in addition to the USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 17 January 1990 a number of ministries and departments have been instructed to provide temporary accommodation and organize food in their health establishments for citizens forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. The cost of their accommodation and food will be met by the recipient organizations for three months. The USSR Ministry of Finance has been tasked with determining a procedure for compensation for this expenditure.

Union republic councils of ministers have been instructed to examine and resolve questions associated with the temporary accommodation of citizens forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR in health establishments belonging to them and organizations under their jurisdiction.

The cost of transporting citizens who were forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR to their temporary accommodation is met, as the resolution indicates, by the USSR Council of Ministers reserve fund, with subsequent compensation from the Azerbaijan SSR budget.

The USSR Ministry of Health and union republic councils of ministers have been tasked with ensuring the implementation of measures to prevent disease and offer medical assistance to citizens forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR in their temporary accommodation.

Under this resolution the USSR State Committee for Public Education and union republic councils of ministers must create conditions for organizing instruction and education for children and adolescents from families forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR in their actual place of residence.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, along with the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, the document says, must prepare and present to the USSR Council of Ministers within two weeks proposals on questions associated with finding work for refugees from the Azerbaijan SSR.

An initiative from the USSR Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the Soviet Peace Foundation, the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Foundation, and the Soviet Charity and Health Foundation regarding material aid for citizens forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR has been approved.

Azerbaijan TV, Radio Chief Appointed

LD1402201590 Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri
2 Feb 90 p 2

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The presidium of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet decrees the appointment of Geysar Veysal ogly Khalilov as chairman of the Soviet Socialist Republic state committee for television and radio broadcasts. [passage omitted]

G.v. Khalilov was born in 1929. He is Azerbaijani and has been member of the CPSU since 1954. He is a lawyer by profession [passage omitted] Since 1964 he has been working as first deputy chairman of the "Knowledge" Society. [passage omitted]

Commandant's Administration Says Baku 'Peaceful'

NC1602111690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0430 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Notice by the Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City dated 16 February—read by announcer]

[Text] The situation was relatively peaceful last night. We announce that in view of the appeals of the workers, intellectuals, and [words indistinct] will be maintained.

Comrades, due to the improving situation in Baku and considering the appeals made by the party and soviet organs, we announce that notices by the commandant's headquarters of the Baku City special district will be issued by the Baku City Internal Affairs Administration as of today.
[Signed] The Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City.

Situation in Baku City 'Improving'

NC1602111290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1700 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Notice by the Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City dated 15 February—read by announcer]

[Text] The Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City announces that the situation in the republic's capital was relatively peaceful during the day. The number of individuals arrested in the [two names indistinct] and Azizbekov districts for violating the state of emergency and the curfew regime is gradually decreasing. In the city, 45 persons were detained in the city during the day: 14 for violating the state of emergency, 25 for violating the curfew, and four for violating the passport regime. Citizen Zeynalov was detained by the military servicemen in the Oktyabr' district for stealing the personal property of the citizens. An investigation is being carried out.

Comrades, regardless of our repeated warnings, individual car drivers continue to violate the traffic laws. This is having serious results. While driving (?his car), citizen [name indistinct] crashed with an armored vehicle in Lenin district yesterday. Citizen (?Kurdemirova), who was in the car, suffered serious injuries and was hospitalized.

We call on the citizens and urge them to comply with the rules of [words indistinct]. We remind the citizens that new curfew passes are to be used as of 0000 hours on 21 February. All the establishments, organizations, and [word indistinct] can have their curfew passes renewed at the district command headquarters from 16 to 20 February. All the leading officials of the establishments and organizations are urged to take the required measures and avoid [words indistinct].

Comrades, taking into consideration the improving situation in Baku and the appeals made by the city's party and soviet organs, we announce that the notices of the military commandant of Baku City will be issued by the Baku City Internal Affairs Administration.
[Signed] The Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City.

Foreign Journalists Visit Baku

NC1502165790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0430 GMT 14 Feb 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers report that television and radio journalists and newspaper correspondents from several countries visited Baku from 11 to 13 February. The foreign guests held talks with Afrand Dashdamirov, chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee State Legal Department. They also met with the administrative board of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan and with the members of [words indistinct].

The foreign jounralists laid bouquets of flowers on the graves of the martyrs, visited various establishments and administrations in Baku, and held talks with the [word indistinct] of the city.

Statistics Workers Meet on Situation in Azerbaijan

NC1502180590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Excerpts] The workers affiliated with the republic's main statistics organ attached significant importance to this meeting. [sentence as heard] What was the reason for this? Regardless of the tense situation, the open meeting, which was held in a [word indistinct] atmosphere, discussed matters which now concern all the republic's citizens. The large meeting hall of the republic's state statistics committee would not accomodate all those who wished to participate in the meeting. However, everyone was able to follow the matters dealt with because the convocation was broadcast by the domestic radio network.

What are the main reasons for the declaration of a state of emergency in Baku? When will the state of emergency be lifted, and what can be done in that regard? Will the incidents that have occurred be politically assessed? What awaits us in the future? Has a concrete program been drawn up to eliminate the crisis situation? Will the fabricated Nagorno-Karabakh problem, which has created the tragic incidents at the present time, be resolved at long last? These and other questions were put to USSR People's Deputies Elmira Kafarova, Muslim Mamedov, Veli Mamedov, and Tofik Ismailov.

What concerned the meeting participants most was the platform of the republic's delegation for the meeting the USSR Supreme Soviet will hold in Moscow on 14 February. The participants primarily wished to know what the position of the Azerbaijani members of the USSR Supreme Soviet was and whether or not the republic's deputies will be able to defend the interests of the people until the end. Our deputies will speak in the USSR Supreme Soviet's meeting on behalf of the people and in accordance with their instructions.

The meeting participants received satisfactory replies to all their questions. Those who heard the speakers did not agree with all the views they expressed. However, they were satisfied with the views the deputies expressed on all the main issues that were taken up during the meeting.

Elmira Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, said at the meeting: For nearly a month now, Baku has been in a difficult situation. A number of developments which began a long time ago have created this state of affairs. Disturbing reports from the Armenian SSR also upset stability in Baku. We must work with all our strength to restore the normal situation in the city. Only our enemies stand to gain from each and every wrong move, including the boycotting of work in the establishments. The quicker we are able to channel life toward its normal direction, the sooner the state of emergency will be lifted.

Muslim Mamedov, first secretary of the Baku City Party Committee, discussed the need to unite all the steadfast forces and movements of the people in the struggle made for the republic's sovereignty and territorial integrity. He said: We must resolutely deal a blow to the instigators, liars, and all the dark forces which engage in activities conflicting with the interests of the people. [passage omitted]

Regardless of the resolute way they defended their position from the military point of view, the participants of the meeting agreed on the need to search for a way to move out of the present crisis. But this should be done not through hastily expressed ideas based on emotion, but through a well considered, wise, and carefully studied approach, they said. The incidents should be taken as a lesson, the activities that have been allowed to take place should be abandoned, and the way to determine and control the course of the developments should be learned in order to upgrade the pace of our progress, they added.

Operational Staff on Situation in Armenia, NKAO

NC1602120190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] The operational staff of the republican council on the special situation has reported that shots were fired from Azerbaijan in the direction of Tekh village in Gorisskiy rayon on the night of 13-14 February, as a result of which one serviceman was wounded. On the same night unidentified riders near Voskepar village of Noyemberyanskiy rayon fired at the village, using automatic weapons. There were no casualties.

The regular daily flights of army helicopters to Getashen have resumed. These helicopters are taking foodstuffs, medicine, and medical teams to the Armenian inhabitants there.

It is reported that Azerbaijani raiders have freed Agadzhanyan, first secretary of the Shaumyanovskiy rayon party committee, whom they took hostage a few weeks ago. The raiders are now holding only one man hostage.

According to a statement by the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry, the handing in of arms by the population is continuing. The population of Araratskiy, Artashatskiy, and Talinskiy rayon are particularly active in this regard.

Medical workers are continuing to treat the refugees in the clinics of Armenia. At present 247 people are under medical care.

Although the army helicopters are participating in the provision of foodstuffs and medicine to the Armenian villages on the borders of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], this is definitely insufficient. The inhabitants of Bertastor village in Shaumyanovskiy rayon are cut off from the rest of the world and already face an acute shortage of foodstuffs.

The Azerbaijani side is sabotaging the reopening of traffic along Goris-Lachin-Getashen road under the supervision of the Soviet Army.

There is considerable popular demand for passenger flights to Stepanakert. The Armenian civil aviation department has the opportunity to increase the number of flights to Stepanakert. However, according to the information provided by the Armenian civil aviation department, after the seventh flight there yesterday, someone at the commandant's office of the internal troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry ordered armored cars to be positioned on the airstrip to prevent the aircraft from landing. The pretext offered is that the Azerbaijani side considers the unscheduled flights as an infringement on its sovereignty. At present, measures are being taken to increase the number of flights to Stepanakert to 15.

The refugee problem has become more acute in recent days because of developments in Tajikistan, from where Armenian families are arriving. Representatives of Armenia's state and public organizations have already met most of them.

Yerevan Reports Changes in Armenian Presidium

NC1602113090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 16 Feb 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper reports that the 14 February meeting of the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the republic's Supreme Soviet debated the report of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. A broad exchange of views took place on the report. It was pointed out that the period under consideration in the report, in particular the last two years, were extremely complex, difficult, tense, and uncertain for our people, who faced the problems of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], Sumgait, the earthquake, and, finally, the forced uprooting of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan. In line with the demands and spirit of the times the Presidium has restructured its activities to assist as much as possible in the stabilization of the situation, the solution of the acute problems that have emerged, and the (?drawing up) and adoption of decisions vital for the people.

While appreciating the positive aspects of the Presidium's activities, the speakers also pointed out with the utmost impartiality that there have been considerable shortcomings and negligence. They put forward concrete proposals aimed at the radical improvement of the operational norms of the entire corps of deputies so as to render it more purposeful and productive.

Though certain deputies demanded the resignation of the entire body of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet did not support that proposal. It also unanimously turned down [as heard] the request of Avedisyan, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, to be relieved of his post.

It was considered expedient to invigorate the structure of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Rafayel Avedisovich Kazaryan was proposed and unanimously elected to the vacant post of deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. The following deputies were elected to the Presidium: Khrachik Rubenovich Simonyan, Levon Akopovich Ter-Petrosyan, and Robert Sedrakovich Kocharyan.

The cable of Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, addressed to the republic's Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers concerning the resumption of the operations of the Nairit Scientific-Production Association was read out. The Supreme Soviet instructed the republic's Council of Ministers to study the issue and report back to the Supreme Soviet.

The session also examined other important matters and passed the pertinent decisions. With that the session ended its deliberations.

NKAO 'Unstable'; Group To Meet Gorbachev

NC1502133790 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] An ARMENPRES corespondent reports from Stepanakert that the peace is unstable in Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO]. The four-man so-called Organizing Committee of Azerbaijan has been in the NKAO for the last 15 days, occupying the oblast party building. The personnel in the building have abandoned it in protest of the arrival of the Organizing Committee.

The labor collectives have declared that the strikes will continue until that illegal Organizing Committee leaves Artsakh.

They say that the blockade has been lifted. That is true, but it has been lifted only for the Azerbaijanis. The blockade of the Armenians of Artsakh is continuing. Loaded trucks are still waiting in Goris, and the road through Lachin is closed.

Armored cars with loudspeakers continue to patrol the streets of Stepanakert, urging the workers to return to work and end the strike, but with no results.

A group of USSR people's deputies and party and soviet workers have left Stepanakert for Moscow to meet Mikhail Gorbachev. Their only request is that the demand of the people of Artsakh be justly dealt with at the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Situation in Armenia Updated 15 Feb

LD1502172690 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Yerevan February 15 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

No cargo trains have crossed into Armenia from Azerbaijan over the past few days despite the agreement to resume rail traffic as of February 13, a session at operational headquartes of the Armenian republic Council for the emergency situation was told today.

One train, carrying goods bound for various regions of the country, was allowed to leave Armenia. An estimated one million-plus tonnes of various scheduled goods have not reached the republic for 45 days, and 180 million roubles-worth of industrial products have not left Armenia.

Seventy-nine trains, mainly with fuel and foodstuffs, crossed into Armenia from Georgia Between February 10 and 14.

The session was told that military helicopters had begun flights to the Armenian village of Getashen, located in Azerbaijani territory, to deliver foodstuffs and medication for the population. They also carried a group of doctors to the village.

The session was also told that First Secretary of the Shaumian district Party Committee V. Agadjanian, who was taken hostage by Azeri militants a few weeks ago, had been freed.

In a number of Armenian districts people continue to turn in weapons to the authorities.

The Armenian procurator-general's office has drawn up and sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet bills on the liability of one union republic for damage caused in another republic and on the refugee status in the Soviet Union.

'Heated' Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Ends

PM1602113790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Sergey Bablumyan under general heading "Direct Line; IZVESTIYA Own Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "After Difficult Debates"]

[Text] Yerevan—The 11th session of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of the 11th convocation has ended. A heated, sometimes excessively heated, discussion of the questions on the agenda continued for three days. Indeed, it was the agenda which gave rise to the seething passions.

The Supreme Soviet adopted laws on changes and additions to the Armenian SSR Constitution and on elections of Armenian SSR people's deputies and local soviet people's deputies.

The dates for the elections were set: The Armenian people's deputies will be elected 20 May this year and the election of local soviets of people's deputies will be held 8 July. The chairman and members of the Central Electoral Commission have been approved.

An analysis of the situation which has taken shape in the republic was given by S. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Describing the situation as extraordinarily tense, he proposed a number of measures which could stabilize the situation in the region. Here special emphasis was placed in particular on the need to remove immediately the economic blockade on Armenia.

The deputies heard and took note of the report on the work of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium delivered by its chairman, G. Voskanyan. The composition of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium was renewed—it has been joined by deputies enjoying public support. R. Kazaryan, member of the board of the Armenian Pannational Movement, corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, was elected deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Supreme Soviet on 1921 Decision on NKAO

NC1502130390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Report by correspondent Stepan (name indistinct) on the continuation of the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Supreme Soviet of Soviet Armenia at Stepan Shaumyav Hall—recorded]

[Excerpts] Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet presidium, opened the session, and talked about the tragic incidents in Tajikistan saying he personally contacted Pallayev, chairman of Tajikistan Supreme Soviet presidium, this morning. Pallayev said that the situation exacerbated yesterday and the unfounded rumors concerning the alleged allocation of houses to 3,000 Armenian refugees from Baku during a grave housing shortage in the city has served as a pretext for the incidents. Following these rumors, meetings, demonstrations, marches, and massacres [word indistinct] have taken place in the city. The local authorities have found it expedient to declare a [word indistinct], and a curfew has been introduced that will start at 1800.

Seven people were killed yesterday, and according to Pallayev, they include five Tajiks, one Russian, and one Tatar. Some of the Armenians living in the city have considered it appropriate to leave everything behind and leave the city. Yesterday 80 people returned to Armenia, and 25 were Armenians who suffered the Leninakan earthquake [Words indistinct] all which had temporarily taken refuge with their friends in Dushanbe. The chairman of the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet presidium also stated that the strictest measures are being taken to restore law and order in the city and to expel all the emissaries from Azerbaijan whose [word indistinct] have served as a pretext for the irresponsible action and hostility against the Armenians living in Tajikistan.

The deputies' commission delivered a report on the 28 January incidents that took place in 26 commissars' rayons in Yerevan. The Supreme Soviet noted that report and instructed the commission to continue its study [words indistinct] and keep the session informed.

Our radio listeners will probably remember that during one of the previous sessions, a deputies' commission was set up to study the 5 July 1921 Politburo decision and report its findings to the Supreme Soviet. Deputy Grachik Simonyan, chairman of that commission addressed the Supreme Soviet.

[Begin Simonyan recording] Resolution on declaring the 5 July 1921 decision of the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, Bolsheviks [RKPB] illegal:

Proceeding from the fact that Nagorno-Karabakh is an inalienable part of Armenia, has never belonged to Azerbaijan, and has been independent between [passage indistinct];

proceeding from the fact that Nagorno-Karabakh's destiny has been decided upon unconstitutionally by the 5 July 1921 arbitrary decision of the unauthorized RKPB Caucasian Bureau which did not have the right to participate in making a nation-state out of another state, thus blatantly intervening in the internal affairs of another sovereign soviet republic—resulting in the principle of national self-determination being trampled;

proceeding from that fact, the wishes of 90 percent of the population of the area and of Soviet Armenia were not taken into consideration;

based on the right of free self-determination of nations, and on the RKPB Central Committee Politburo's decision during its 7 July 1920 meeting under Lenin which stipulated that Nagorno-Karabakh's fate should be determined on the basis of ethnic composition and in accordance with the will of its people;

based on the 12 (?June) 1921 Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (?declaration), which proceeding from the (?joint) declaration with Azerbaijan and from the agreement reached between the governments of the Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR] of Armenia and Azerbaijan, had declared Nagorno-Karabakh an inalienable part of the Soviet Armenian Republic;

pointing out that the right to free self-determination of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabkh was also recognized by the 30 November 1920 decision and 1 September 1920 declaration of Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic's Central Committee;

supporting consistently defending the right to self-determination of nations which has been enshrined in the treaty on the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the USSR Constitution as a foundation for the interethnic relations in the multinational soviet state;

the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic's Supreme Soviet resolves:

To consider RKPB Central Committee Caucasian Bureau's 5 July 1921 decison on Nagorno-Karabakh—as a result of which self-determination for the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh has been [word indistinct], a part of a territory of the Armenian SSR has been subjected to annexation, and the Armenian people have been divided—as illegal, incompatible with international law, and [words indistinct]. [end recording]

This proposal by the commission was unanimously endorsed. It was decided to draw up a draft on this issue and submit it to the Supreme Soviet for consideration.

Next, the session heard the report of the Supreme Soviet Presidium presented by Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Addressing the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium's activities over the last two years and referring to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], which bothers our people most these days, and to the work in the disaster zone and related problems, Deputy Voskanyan said in particular:

[Begin Voskanyan recording] Comrades, since February [1988] the republic and all of the Armenian people live with the problems and concerns of the NKAO. As a product of restructuring, the NKAO problem has become the touchstone of restructuring [word indistinct] in Armenia. The NKAO problem requires a [word indistinct] serious scientific study [words indistinct], in the advancement of people's national self-consciousness. However, because we are accountable to the people, we must assess it properly today.

Therefore, raising the NKAO problem and searching for a political solution (?are natural to our times) and are directly connected with the policy of restructuring, democracy, and openness which instilled people with hope about the triumph of justice; it gave hope and belief that along with the numerous problems facing the country, many problems [word indistinct] of interethnic relations. It was that very belief which brought forth an unprcedented outburst [passage indistinct]. The failure to give a political assessment to the Sumgait genocide [passage indistinct] resulted in the extreme exacerbation of interethnic relations, the bloodshed of hundreds of people, and a wave of thousands of refugees. The republican party and government bodies declined to lead the pan-national movement because they were not prepared to respond quickly to powerful daily developments during February 1988 when hundreds of thousands of people took to the streets in protest.

It is obvious that the NKAO problem is a political issue. That problem was and is there. However, it is also obvious that it could not have been resolved in a few days. It requires a sensible approach and actions. It requires resolve and consistency. On 15 July 1988, the republic's Supreme Soviet moved by Article 72 of the USSR Constitution and expressing the will of the Armenia population of NKAO and Armenian Republic adopted the well-known decision concerning the integration of NKAO into the structure of Armenia.

The issue was next taken up by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium [words indistinct]. The 18 July 1988 meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium—which was very serious psychologically and whose consequences were very important [words indistinct]. For the first time [passage indistinct]. Reinstitution of justice was demanded. During the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session, the republic's representatives were able to convince the session that the NKAO (?problem) exists. As a result it endorsed a decision radically different from the (?first draft) which considered the NKAO problem closed forever and the decision of the Armenian Supreme Soviet incompatible with the USSR Constitution. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decision included two substantial points which encouraged the belief that the problem will not be shelved at a later date.

The USSR Supreme Soviet session of November 1988 was again presented with the NKAO problem. [Passage indistinct]. In contrast to the former times, the new outburst of the NKAO problem was the focus of the republic's leadership and of the Supreme Soviet Presidium from the first day. It is sufficient to state that for the last 20 months the presidium has refered to the NKAO problem dozens of times. It has adopted decisions for the implementation of the decision made at the extraordinary meeting of the oblast soviet of people's deputies; it actively worked in this direction with the central and neighboring republic's pertinent authorities.

Were we able to do everything possible during this period? Were there other more productive avenues? The analysis of the work done forces us to conclude that the Armenian Supreme Soviet has utilized all existing possibilities. It held many meetings at the USSR Communist Party [words indistinct], private and group meetings on diverse occasions; it issued statements and reports at the scientific conferences preceeding the CPSU Central Committee plenum devoted to interethnic relations.

Finally, there is also the important decision our republic's Supreme Soviet made. The whole country and world know about [words indistinct]. The grave misfortune of solution to the problem being postponed is not our fault. As a result of this postponment a serious emotional climate emerged in NKAO and in our republic. The 28 November 1989 decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet led to a new phase in the history of the problem. Everyone knows the [word indistinct] and the results of it. The 10th extraordinary joint session of the republic's Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council on 1 December 1989 declared Soviet Armenia and NKAO reunited. You are also aware of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's 10 January 1990 decision which, in line with the 5th clause of Article 115 of the USSR Constitution, has instructed the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium to take measures to bring the republic's legislative acts in line with the USSR Constitution.

Unfortunately, even now the expression of the will of the people of NKAO—a problem which resulted from restructuring—for its right to self-determination is looked upon as a mere territorial demand, an encroachment on the territory of the neighboring republic. We have refuted this perception before. The demand of the Armenian population of NKAO is just and must be given a political solution. The Armenian Supreme Soviet must continue its consistent work on this issue. [passage omitted] [end recording]

The Supreme Soviet also heard the second reading of the report by the other deputies' commission. Committee Chairman Suren Avedisyan delivered a speech. However, the deputies again made a number of suggestions and presented observations to reword and include a number of new points in the draft concerning the need to give a political assessment to the barbaric incidents in Baku and make the culprits accountable.

Dear radio listeners, the session will continue its deliberations tomorrow.

Case Stated for Non-Ethnic Estonians

PM1502163990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 90 Second Edition p 3

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent I. Teterin under the rubric "The USSR—Our Common Home": "Estonia: Destiny of a State"]

[Text] Tallinn—Today's events compel us to talk about a very important question. In its simplest form, it is as follows: Where is the small Baltic state called Estonia going, and how will it turn out in the future if the present social development trends prevail here?

Not for nothing do I call Estonia a state. It has been one and it remains one today—a sovereign socialist country that is part of the Soviet Union. These are not just fancy words; it is an absolute fact that we simply cannot ignore in our deliberations.

But let us consider how new countries come into being. Alas, history provides few examples where this has been an easy, painless process. More often than not states emerge as a result of crises and wars, hatred and violence—in short, all the things that are totally at odds with our current notions of a civilized era in mankind's development. And it is no secret that the history of the emergence of Estonian statehood is in that category. Let us cast our minds back.

The maelstrom of the October Revolution and subsequent civil war, invasion by the German occupiers, as well as the bayonets of the overseas interventionists—the land of Estonia went through all this before it acquired independence. On 2 February 1920 an agreement was signed in Tartu between the Estonian Republic and Soviet Russia. The Peace of Tartu is the eloquent name by which it has gone done in the annals of history.

Here is a typical detail: In 1920 Soviet Russia not only recognized Estonia as an independent sovereign state, but also gave it substantial assistance in shaping its life. For example, under the terms of the Tartu Treaty, the young Baltic republic was given 15 million gold rubles, which covered the initial issue of the Estonian crown. Share capital belonging to banks in the Russian Empire was also handed over free to the young state. And all the other Russian assets—buildings, fortifications, ports, warships—became Estonian property. One should add to this all the concessions that were granted to the young republic at the time—a trade treaty on the basis of most favored nation status, forestry and railroad concessions, and release from liability for loans taken out and debts accrued in czarist times.

In other words, without Soviet Russia's goodwill and without its international assistance Estonia would probably not have become an independent state.

This all came back to me recently, when the 70th anniversary of the Peace of Tartu was being celebrated in Tallinn. On that day all levels of people's deputies assembled in the Estonian capital to declare that the "only guarantee of the existence and development of the Estonian people is independent statehood." The deputies' assembly adopted a document called "Declaration on the Question of Estonian State Independence." It put a proposal to the USSR Supreme Soviet on starting talks about restoring the independence of the Estonian state.

I will be frank and say that this development, the adoption of this declaration was no surprise at all to the majority of the people in the republic. Because recently the sense of existing dependence has not only been openly propagandized in Estonia by a new generation of politicians, but has been confirmed in legislative acts and government decisions and in resolutions by local organs of power.

For example, last year the republic's Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution which described Estonia's joining the USSR in 1940 as an "occupation" and "annexation." No one was even embarrassed by the incongruity: There have never been cases where an occupying country has achieved a higher standard of living on conquered territory than at home. As a result of the adoption of the resolution young people started refusing to serve in the Army, citing the 1949 Geneva Convention, which says that an "occupying state cannot make people under its control serve in its armed or auxiliary forces." Take the other day, when the Tallinn authorities imposed a strict ban on the registration in the city of people from outside Estonia, that is, from the USSR; and this list of measures currently being adopted goes on and on.

Of course, each people's right to self-determination is a declared principle of Lenin's nationalities policy and is enshrined in the USSR Constitution. Therefore Estonia is fully entitled to secede from the Union. Incidentally, if it wants to do this, it is no use abusing the union of remaining Soviet republics, branding it an "occupier." It is much more important to evaluate all the realities before making the final choice—continue to live together or live apart. They are as follows.

The Estonian economy's thorough integration in the union national economic complex is an inescapable fact. The social policies of the republic and of the USSR as a whole are just as tightly bound up together. But perhaps the third factor is the most important—the ethnic [etnicheskiy] or, as we now say, inter-ethnic [mezhnatsionalnyy] factor.

As it happens, over the years of Soviet power Estonia has become home for nearly 600,000 people from other republics. This is their new homeland. We are not going to discuss whether that is good or bad. It is inappropriate to hypothesize when talking about established human lives. But imagine the predicament of hundreds of thousands of people who are now wondering what the future holds in store for them if Estonia becomes an independent state again. After all, they have been been Soviet citizens since birth, citizens of a great country. So why give it up now? Or become emigres? Or maybe they will even end up having to swell the throng of refugees which has swept in from the Transcaucasus?

No one has yet given the non-Estonian population of the republic answers to these questions. No one has given any guarantees. Neither the central government of the USSR, nor the republican organs of power. That is a pity. After all, in politics every action provokes a reaction. So the recent "Declaration on the Question of Estonian State Independence" caused a sharp reaction on the part of the republic's Russian-speaking population. A committee for the defense of Soviet power and civil rights in Estonia was immediately set up. In its first statement the committee voiced a lack of confidence in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, announced a boycott of republican laws adopted since 16 November 1988, and called for civil disobedience on the part of the population.

Let us be honest—the confrontation in Estonia has become dangerous. And one can easily imagine its continuing to get worse. Because the advocates of Estonian self-determination outside the framework of the USSR are repeatedly stating their firm intent. For example, a so-called Estonian congress is planned for the very near future. Many candidate deputies for the republican parliament are making passionate speeches in an attempt to persuade their voters that their main task is Estonia's speediest achievement of state independence. But the reality is that the Russian-speaking population does not intend to be idle either. So how are the dangerous contradictions to be resolved?

There can be only one solution, if we really do regard the norms of democratic life as unassailable. Talks are needed—representative, honest, consistent talks. But I would like to stipulate that these talks must be tripartite talks. Because, you will agree, we will not have left Stalin's times very far behind if two powers (in this case, the USSR and Estonia) resolve interstate issues behind the backs of 600,000 local people, who do not want to forfeit their right to be citizens of the USSR, with all that that offers. Personally, I am convinced that the destiny of future Estonian statehood can only be resolved on the basis of consensus among all three sides. And the talks could possibly result in the conclusion of a new union treaty between Estonia and the Soviet Union.

But the last thing I want to do is to guess, by looking into the future, whether Estonia will remain part of a renewed Soviet federation or will, perhaps, choose the path certain ethnic forces are urging: "Let us be poor, but free." As is known, the criterion of truth in politics is action, not words. But the most important thing now is to prevent the conflicts from reaching danger point. After all, the lesson of history is that a state will only be successful if its inhabitants can view the future with confidence.

But Estonia, we repeat, was and still is a sovereign state. And this should not be forgotten when we consider the future of the republic and the destiny of its multinational populace. Ultimately they have to build Estonia's future as a sovereign state and endow that concept with new substance.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Holds Session 15 Feb

LD1502183890

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0800 GMT on 15 February broadcasts a live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga.

Chairman Anatoliy Gorbunov opens the 15th session, which is the last session of the 11th convocation. A count of 273 registered deputies is established, a number sufficient to allow the session to decide on all matters. Gorbunov reads 18 items on the agenda.

Gorbunov mentions a great number of protests from the military districts on the proposed changes in the legislation concerning housing.

Dainis Ivans, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the People's Front expresses concern about a protest published in the PADOMJU JAUNATNE, (SOVIET YOUNG PEOPLE), referring to this newspaper by its old name, and the SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH on 14 February by an army unit against a decision to be adopted today on taking away privileges from certain categories of retired officers intending to move to Latvia in the future. This was not only a protest, but a threat, "for the first time in the history of peace-time Latvia threats have been voiced of physically settling the score with deputies, an appeal for a pogrom of deputies if they vote for a decision that does not correspond to the interests of this group." This concerns the safety of everybody participating at this session, and Ivans suggests establishing a commission to look into it.

Ivans then requests a moment of silence for the victims of Baku and Dushanbe, which is observed. Vilens Tolpeznikovs suggests a telegram to the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet expressing sympathy to the victims and demanding punishment of the guilty.

Gorbunov deals with proposals from the fund of culture, soviet of the city of Ventspils, and from citizens and deputies for reexamining the law of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet elections, excluding from voting soldiers on active service, but this question was decided two sessions ago. "We discussed this question and came to the conclusion that this problem remained because we had not, after all, comprehended at the very beginning, and we were not solving it in such a way as, perhaps, I do not want to compare, the colleague deputies of Lithuania did. They adopted a law on citizenship. Therewith all the questions proceed along an entirely different course. We refused the law on citizenship and began to move along various zig-zag roads. Well, perhaps, I would not like to describe it like that, but at least to me it seems like that." If they did not want to postpone the elections for another six or three months they could do practically nothing.

Various proposals and amendments to the items on the agenda and on new items to be included continue. If all the 18 items and some five more items on the agenda cannot be dealt with today and tomorrow, as appears more than likely, then the session will continue on 1 and 2 March. Discussion on the second item on the agenda, on the local self-governments, is concluded before the session adjourns for lunch.

When the session resumes work after the lunch break, the count of deputies shows only 237 present. The next item on the agenda concerns the declaration of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on the state independence of Latvia, and after further comments Gorbunov reads the text of the draft declaration and follows this with some explanations.

Juris Bojars, USSR people's deputy, has an amendment to the draft declaration and firsthand experience to relate from the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. After two more contributions, Deputy Zukulis, chairman of the Latvian SSR KGB, recalls the events of 1940 and the Red Army's role.

USSR People's Deputy Vulfsons contradicts what Zukulis said.

After a number of other speakers the declaration is adopted with 177 voting for, 48 against, and 14 abstaining. After a 30-minute break the session continues its work.

The number of deputies present is 262, and the next item on the agenda, on the Latvian SSR state flag, anthem, and coat of arms is discussed. After an informative report by academician Janis Stradins and some discussion the necessary law on changes in the Latvian SSR Constitution is voted on with 214 votes for, two against, and 41 abstaining. The result is greeted with prolonged applause. Likewise the laws on the flag, anthem, and coat of arms are adopted with 0, 11 and 0 votes against, respectively, and 30, 48, and 35 abstentions. Gorbunov is presented with red-white-red carnations, but there is a speech of "verbal mud-slinging" by the Inter-Front's Lopatin.

With this the session's first day concludes.

Supreme Soviet Votes For Independence

LD1502180790

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0800 GMT begins to carry a live relay from the House of Political Education in Riga of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

At 1316 GMT the session begins a discussion on the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet declaration on the state of Latvian independence. At 1333 GMT Gorbunov reads the declaration's text. At 1505 GMT the declaration is adopted with 177 votes for, 48 votes against, 14 abstentions.

The session and live relay conclude at 1644 GMT.

Draft Declaration of Independence

LD1502234790 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1333 GMT 15 Feb 90

["Draft declaration" of independence of the Republic of Latvia, read out by Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, at the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session in Riga on 15 February—live]

[Text] Taking into account the decisions of several local soviets of people's deputies, applications by Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic citizens, and also statements by some public movements and organizations on the need to restore the state independence of the Republic of Latvia, and taking into consideration the decision of 24 December 1989 of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies, by which the secret protocols which the USSR and Germany signed on the 23 August 1939, and the division of spheres of interest carried out in them, because it is in contradiction with the sovereignty and independence of several third countries including Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, have been defined and recognized a juridically groundless and not in force since the moment of their signing.

Taking into consideration also a conclusion by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet's commission according to which the declaration on Latvia joining the composition of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been recognized as illegal since its adoption at the saeima on 21 July 1940.

The Supreme Soviet of Latvia—taking facts of this kind into consideration—the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet:

First. Condemns the declaration of 21 July 1940 adopted by the Saeima of Latvia on Latvia joining the composition of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, because it was adopted without ascertaining the will of the entire people of Latvia, and, as a result, led to the loss of independence of the Republic of Latvia.

Second. On the basis of the declaration of 28 July 1989 of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on the sovereignty of the people of Latvia, [it] takes a stance for undertakings which must be carried out in order to transform the Latvian SSR into a free and independent State of Latvia in such a union of states which will go along a truly humanely democratic road of socialism and which will develop its relations with other countries on the basis of treaties.

Third. To charge the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with the task of forming a commission in which various national groups an public organizations will be extensively represented to prepare undertakings skillfully and efficiently, including organizing of referendums, for the restoration of the economic and political independence of Latvia and the drawing up of the draft treaties. All the work of the commission is to be carried out democratically and openly, by extensively informing the society and inhabitants of the republic and by discussion with them. The proposals by the commission are to be submitted to the Supreme Soviet of the new convocation.

Latvia To 'Work for Independence'

LD1502202990 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Riga February 15 TASS—The Supreme Soviet (parliament) of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic met in session here today to discuss bills on the people's self-government. Discussions have shown that it is not an easy matter to transfer power to district, town and provincial soviets so as to make them effective masters in their territories. To proclaim a right is one thing—to exercise it fully is something else.

The transfer of power to the soviets renews the question of cadre. The new laws set high professional standards for executives. Two-thirds of the newly elected people's deputies, however, are unfamiliar with the functions of the soviets. This is why the session decided to set up an inter-departmental body to ensure the preparation for, and the introduction of, local self-government and the training of officials for it.

This session, the last for the present legislature, is also discussing changes of the state emblematica. The decision to restore old national symbols was made the previous session. But pickets at the entrance today expressed disagreement with the decision. Some view it as the restoration of bourgeois values, others say the decision would only be legitimate if the old state were restored. However, most of the deputies and common citizens view this move as a tribute to the people's memory.

The session adopted a statement condemning the Seym declaration of July 21, 1940 on Latvia's entrance into the Soviet Union. The statement says the declaration was adopted without making clear the will of the entire people and led, as a result, to the loss of Latvian independence.

The Latvian parliament voted to work for Latvian independence within a union of states following the path towards humane and democratic socialism and building their relations with other states on a treaty basis.

The session, whose agenda comprises 19 items, continues deliberations.

Gorbunov on Latvian Supreme Soviet

LD1502193490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] The 15th session of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic of the 11th convocation began its work in Riga today. Our correspondent Ninel Meshkun invited Anatoliy Valeryanovich Gorbunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the republic, to the microphone.

[Begin Gorbunov recording] In my opinion, the question of local self-government was a very important one. Unfortunately, we did not adopt this law a third time, and I do not feel the least bit sorry; on the contrary, I am glad at the fact that deputies, especially newly elected local deputies, are discussing this draft with such interest. I am sure that a truly good draft is being born. We are constantly worried by the issue of ownership, and not just we alone in the republic, but I think in the whole of the union. Now at the session we adopted our alternative draft law on ownership in the USSR, and making use of the legislative initiative of the republican Supreme Soviet we submit it as an alternative draft for consideration in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Meshkun] Today and tomorrow the deputies have to decide the fate of the laws on local self-government, on creating a public self-government system, on alternative labor service, on constitutional supervision, and on introducing changes to the Constitution, criminal code, housing code, and labor code. Issues on the Latvian state anthem, cost of arms and flag, declaration of state independence, and the draft decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR—which was prepared by the Latvian Council of Ministers—on suspending the validity of the decisions by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Government on the territory of the republic and with regard to concessions to servicemen were also considered by the session. [end recording]

Latvian Resolution on Military, Environment

90UN0845C Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 14 Jan 90 p 3

[Resolution issued by Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet in Riga on 12 January: "On the Work of the Working Group Formed by the Presidium of the Latvian SSR

Supreme Soviet to Study the Effects to the Republic Environment Caused by the Activities of Military Units"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the LaSSR [Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic] **resolves**:

1. To take into consideration the information presented by the leader of the working group, Comrade A.K. Chepanis, deputy chairman of the LaSSR Council of Ministers, on the group's work in studying the effects caused by the activities of military units to the surrounding environment of the republic.

2. To charge the working group jointly with the Baltic Military District and local soviets of people's deputies with developing proposals on eliminating the effects caused to the republic's environment by the activities of military units, and to present these proposals prior to 15 April 1990 for examination and decision by the LaSSR Council of Ministers; proposals requiring amendments to existing republic law will be presented to the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet.

To conduct in 1990 an inspection of all territories located in the republic and falling under the disposition of the USSR Ministry of Defense, LaSSR KGB, and LaSSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, including the depths of the earth, to determine usage regulations and the feasibility of their further use for military purposes, especially in resort areas and places of rest and recreation for the population.

3. To charge the LaSSR Council of Ministers jointly with the Baltic Military District and local soviets of people's deputies with preparing proposals regarding the further use of military forest areas, and developing a system for managing these areas.

4. To take into consideration the fact that the Baltic Military District continues to develop and accomplish measures to improve environmental protection, coordinating these with local organs of authority.

5. To hold that, under conditions of a sovereign republic and implementation of the law on economic independence, the requirements of the Constitution and other laws of the republic extend to military units located on LaSSR territory.

6. To charge the LaSSR State Committee on the Protection of Nature with exercising supervision of the execution of this resolution.

[signed] A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet

I. Daudish, secretary of the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet

Riga, 12 January 1990.

Military Units Damage Latvian Environment

90UN0845B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 14 Jan 90 p 3

[Unattributed report on report by Deputy A.K. Chepanis, working group leader, and the ensuing discussion by deputies at the 14th Session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet 11th Convocation in Riga on 11-12 January: "On Work Accomplished to Study the Consequences to the Latvian Environment of the Activities of Military Units"]

[Text] Dear deputies! The working group formed in accordance with the 24 August 1989 resolution of the Presidium of the LaSSR [Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has conducted an analysis over this period of violations and consequences caused to the surrounding environment of the republic by the activities of military units. Materials used include those obtained by the working group from the People's Control Committee, State Committee on the Protection of Nature, Ministry of Health, the production association "Latviyas Mezhs," Society for the Protection of Nature and Monuments of the LaSSR, and rayon ispolkoms [executive committees]. It must be noted, however—and all inhabitants of the republic should be aware—that the ispolkoms of Balvskiy, Bauskiy, Gulbenskiy, Limbazhskiy, Ludzenskiy, and Talsinskiy Rayons did not consider it necessary, unfortunately, to provide the working group with materials requested from them. In our view, this alone attests to their attitude toward the condition of their territory.

Analysis of the materials shows that violations of the law governing the protection of nature by military units have been verified in almost all rayons of the republic. Upon a proposal of the working group, rayon committees have been established in those rayons where military unit activity has been especially intense to conduct comprehensive inspections of the territories where regimental-size military units are located. These comprehensive checks have been conducted mainly in Dobelskiy, Liyepayskiy, and Saldusskiy Rayons.

The air training range of the USSR Ministry of Defense in Saldusskiy Rayon is located on land suitable for meeting agricultural needs. The range has a detrimental effect on the ecological environment of the region, and on the health and safety of its inhabitants. Routine bombing runs conducted against targets greatly increase the level of noise and vibration in the city of Saldus and its suburbs, and have introduced a real danger in this respect. In 1988, a powerful explosion of heavy charges knocked out the windows in the Saldus department store, High School No. 2, and several residences. Losses incurred by the LaSSR economy as a result of the presence of the air training range—approximate calculations, of course—amount to the following: gross agricultural production losses total more than 700 million rubles [R]; over R40 million would be necessary to restore neglected land which could be used for agriculture. Taking these factors into consideration, the inhabitants of Saldusskiy Rayon, as certified by more than 7,000 signatures, and the rayon ispolkom find it necessary to do away with the test center, thus providing for their safety and obtaining about 18,000 hectares of land for agricultural use.

Our working group has received a great many letters from residents of Saldus and its rayon, and also supports this proposal. It is true that several days prior to the session, the leadership of the Air Force Baltic Military District spoke with the leadership of the LaSSR Council of Ministers and expressed a readiness to discuss with the republic leadership and local organs of authority the question of organizing further use of territory under the disposition of military units.

A commission formed in Liyepayskiy Rayon conducted a detailed examination of all military units in the rayon and delivered its proposals to the working group with respect to each. It was ascertained that in a majority of these units there is no clarification as to what land that contains radar and radio communications equipment is under their authority. There are no disease-control specifications, no sanitary zones determined by appropriate contemporary requirements. The use of radar equipment located at certain military units has resulted in manyfold increases above the norm in electromagnetic field strength in Vaynede, Rutsava, Perkone, Grobine, Pape, Nitse, and Tsiyemupe—the increase in Vaynede is actually elevenfold.

During the period 1976 through 1988, a Baltic Fleet unit regularly destroyed ammunition, including phosphorous bombs used by aircraft, at the Pape training range in Liyepayskiy Rayon. This was a gross violation of laws on the protection of nature. As a result, 14 people in the republic picked up pieces of phosphorous, mistaking them for amber, and received chemical burns. Comrade Lantsers, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, reported this back on 29 July of last year. I can inform the deputies of the Supreme Soviet that the Baltic Fleet Procuracy took until December to complete its investigation. Former officers Kashtanov, Parfedenko, and Abrosimov were held criminally responsible for negligence of official duty. We still do not know the results of court proceedings in this matter.

Last summer a session of the Soviet of People's Deputies of Liyepayskiy Rayon adopted a resolution on the need to close the Pape test area. Asked about this matter by the LaSSR Council of Ministers, USSR Minister of Defense Yazov replied that the ministry was prepared to consider the question of moving the Pape training range to another part of the republic to conform with the requirements pertaining to air training centers, but this would be done using republic resources.

Relations between local residents and a military unit in Yurmaltsiyems settlement, Liyepayskiy Rayon, have become greatly aggravated because of illegal construction in the 300-meter coastal zone. The working group considers unacceptable the construction of new facilities in the one-km zone of the protective belt along the coasts of the Baltic Sea and Gulf of Riga. Construction and remodeling projects for all facilities absolutely must be coordinated with the Committee on the Protection of Nature. It is necessary in our view to reinforce the rights of inspectors of the LaSSR State Committee on the Protection of Nature with respect to monitoring protection of the environment and observance of the law over all territory on which USSR Armed Forces units are situated. In this regard, it is necessary to register all military units and enterprises, economic, construction, and other facilities of the USSR Armed Forces located in the republic with the LaSSR State Committee on the Protection of Nature as potential sources of pollution, so as to be able to conduct further environmental protection supervision.

The working group verified the commission of various violations of the laws protecting nature in other regions as well. There is hardly a single housing complex in which waste collection is properly managed; unauthorized auxiliary structures are often erected which present the environs in an aesthetically unpleasant light and create unsanitary conditions; there are not the simplest structures for sewage purification, no system for protecting against atmospheric pollution. The available water purification facilities operate ineffectively almost everywhere; authorization is not obtained for special use of water; and in most instances there is no authorization for discharging pollutants into the atmosphere. The rayon ispolkom has no land charts, materials, or registration data for areas occupied by military units. The working group proposes, in connection with the republic's transition to economic independence and the introduction of payment for natural resources, to also establish a financing procedure for the use of those lands which are turned over to the Armed Forces.

Certain military units use and squander minerals and forest resources which belong to the republic. Military forest management facilities on republic territory do not observe the LaSSR forestry code. Trees are felled illegally and there is no systematic forest restoration. Nor is there any appropriate accounting or registration of this activity. For example, in the Inchukalnskiy section of the Baltic Fleet forest management facility, the "Komfort" cooperative illegally cut down 450 pine and spruce trees, amounting to 230 cubic meters, thus causing R27,000 in damage. What happened with the lumber, how much the "Komfort" cooperative received for it, and how much the military forestry people received for giving their permission; we do not know today. Materials regarding the illegal felling of these trees have been handed over to the procuracy. In this regard, the working group proposes that the conduct of forestry in all forest regions of Latvia—including those in military areas—be transferred to a single manager, which could be the republic production association "Latviyas Mezhs."

It must be noted that, in spite of the above-mentioned violations, the Baltic Military District procuracy stated in response to the inquiry of the working group that criminal proceedings were not instituted regarding violations in the sphere of environmental protection; in other words, nothing happened. The Baltic Fleet procuracy instituted criminal proceedings only in connection with the above-mentioned Pape training range in Liyepayskiy Rayon.

Violations of the law on the part of representatives of military units have become more frequent during the past two years. Information from the production association "Latviyas Mezhs" indicates there have been 15 incidents of illegal hunting. State inspectors for protection of fish and water resources uncovered 16 violations. This is evidence, in my view, of the all-permissiveness syndrome which is seen, unfortunately, in certain military units.

The arrogant attitude shown by the Armed Forces toward territory in which military units are situated can also be seen in the fact on 28 November last year, at the first general meeting of our working group, group members from the Baltic Military District and Baltic Fleet failed to attend. Only a representative of the border district troops participated, whose activity, at least in our view, has been least harmful to the environment of the republic, and whose record in this sphere should be imitated by other military units.

Again I refer to the military radar units and radio communications equipment located in the republic. We must get the Ministry of Defense to provide the LaSSR Council of Ministers reference data on the zone in which the influence of an electromagnetic field is perceptible in the health of the population. Such data are quite necessary in the development of an integrated plan for protecting environment in the republic. The working group recommends that all rayon ispolkoms form rayon commissions and conduct an examination of all military facilities located in their areas, that they report the results of their inspections to the Latvian Council of Ministers prior to 15 March of this year.

Taking under consideration the proposal of the deputies, we believe the LaSSR Council of Ministers should prepare an appropriate government resolution on these matters. Regarding those matters which fall under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Soviet, proposals must be introduced in the Supreme Soviet providing for the necessary changes in legislation.

There has been no opportunity to summarize what has been accomplished, due to the tremendous quantity of materials and great work volume. The working group therefore requests permission from the Supreme Soviet to continue this effort. We propose to discuss this report today and adopt the draft resolution in the version in which it was introduced by the working group to today's session of the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

Discussion of Information Provided by A. Chepanis

The bombs continue to fall deep in the very heart of Kurzeme even today, 45 years after the war; these were the bitter words of A. Brigmanis, first secretary of Saldusskiy Raykom [Rayon Party Committee]. It is taking place on the territory of the former Zvartskaya Volost, where the so-called Saldus training ground is located on about 24,000 hectares.

In 1939, the population of this volost numbered more than 3,000. There were 501 peasant farms here. Almost 80 percent of the land was used for agriculture and accounted annually for the production of 8,200 tons of grain, 8,700 tons of milk, and 850 tons of meat. Today with such an amount of food production we would be able to feed half the inhabitants of the region.

Today these lands are overgrown with weeds and shrubbery. But no extent of material damages can compare with the barbarism committed by the military, Brigmanis emphasized. A cemetery is located on the training ground land. Local residents shudder in horror when they hear a new roar of aircraft, knowing that these machines will be bombing the remains of their relatives. The question arises—who has given the command to fix a cemetery as a direct bomb target? Incidentally, the Soviet Army also drops explosives on the graves of Soviet rule activists in Ladskaya Volost, shot by "Ayzsargi" forest guards in the Brotsenskiy Forest on 25 June 1941....

People want to recover the land of their ancestors and their true history, the speaker continued. The signatures of almost 8,000 people provide confirmation of this, and they are supported by the rayon leadership and those who have stood during these two days on the street near the building of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

I should say that there are people who feel otherwise, who assert that you won't find anybody who wants to work in Zvartskaya Volost. On this very territory, on the land of their ancestors, almost 40 families have already expressed the desire to start farms. I think you would also find a place there for horticultural cooperatives, especially since Zvarta is a very picturesque section. Therefore, in my view, we should consider seriously what is more important—to be contented or well-armed.

The speaker went on to say that Kurzeme, one of the prettiest and richest regions of the republic, is practically closed to foreigners because of the military bases.

M. Raman, deputy chairman of the LaSSR Council of Ministers, noted that the Baltic Military District would get involved in republic plans for economic and social development only when it was necessary to relocate one military facility or another, or approve the construction of a new facility in Riga where, as we know, a number of military schools have been constructed. The deputy cited the example of the "Rumbul" airfield, relocated in the seventies, for which the USSR Ministry of Defense did not object to using resources and capital investments allocated to the military. The airfield was actually relocated without involving use of republic funds. The deputy categorically objected to relocating the Pape facility at the sole expense of the republic, condemning the formula "If you need it—then you do it." Such demands are entirely without justification.

Today when USSR defense doctrine is changing, the speaker emphasized, when we are reducing the Armed Forces, we must categorically demand that the military observe ecological regulations in exemplary fashion. Raman proposed that stronger wording be used in the draft resolution, establishing, for example, that under conditions of the republic's economic independence, all military subunits, 100 percent, will be subordinate to republic jurisdiction. Certification should also be issued for all facilities, even if they are secret. People have to know about radiation doses and other factors detrimental to their health. Not only the working group, but the Baltic Military District and appropriate subunits as well must participate in developing proposals.

The floor was then turned over to V. Romanenko, Baltic Military District environmental protection inspector. Romanenko noted the work of the commission in gathering and analyzing materials related to the influence of military units on the Latvian environment, and felt it necessary to comment that in the past two years a great deal more attention in the military district was being devoted to matters of environmental protection. A specific ecological program through the year 2005 has been determined. Environmental-protection inspectors have been appointed on orders in all major units and official duty positions for such inspectors have been introduced at Defense Ministry enterprises in Riga. Specific deadlines have been set for establishing norms to regulate harmful discharges into the atmosphere. Toxic-waste inventory is being conducted in military units, district establishments, and enterprises jointly with the

During 1988-1989, 10 purification complexes were constructed in the military district and put into operation, and major overhaul was conducted on six. Decisions were made last year on the elimination and relocation of a number of military facilities. Execution of one of these moves is being hindered by Gosplan [State Planning Committee] failure to execute the appropriate resolution of the Council of Ministers. Last year alone, 42 individuals were held liable and subject to disciplinary, financial, and party measures for violations of environmental protection legislation. Over R4,000 were exacted directly from the guilty parties.

The speaker stated that negligence in previous years on the part of certain leaders, including military leaders, and sometimes at a criminal level, has led to petroleum-product pollution in those rayons where civilian and military airfields are located. And although there was some degree of success last year in regulating the storage and issue of aviation fuel, the problem of eliminating the aftereffects of prior activity remains. It will be difficult to accomplish this without the help of local organs, since the military district lacks the necessary personnel, resources, instrumentation, equipment, and technology.

Touching on matters regarding the Saldus training area, the speaker stressed that this test area was established based on instructions from the LaSSR Council of Ministers dated 25 May 1955. Its boundaries were selected as the optimal variant of that day which would result in the least amount of damage to the economy, nature, and the people of Latvia. Addressing the inadvisability of eliminating the training ground, the speaker cited the view of the Air Force Command, arguing the assertion that existing borders provide safety and security to the local population, and that work at the site is done under the supervision of inspectors, officials, and command personnel of the military district. In addition, the Saldus training ground is the only air center where combat training is developed and perfected for units located in Baltic Military District territory within the combat training system of all USSR Air Forces.

V. Romanenko went on to express his interest in developing closer contacts with the working group appointed by the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet than existed previously. Referring to Comrade Chepanis' claim that representatives of the Baltic Military District failed to attend the group session, he stated that as a member of the group he was only informed of the 28 November meeting on 1 December. And there was only one meeting.

In Romanenko's opinion, the fact that Baltic Military District representatives were detached from the working group has led to the presence of many inaccuracies and errors in the information presented. It was indicated in the group's materials on the troop unit in Ventspils, for example, that biological purification facilities of 200 cubic-meter capacity were not providing purification of the 800 cubic meters of sewage entering the system. In actuality, these purification facilities, rebuilt in 1988, have a capacity of about 1,000 cubic meters per day. Also, it is stated in the group's materials that biological purification facilities at the Dobele unit are not functioning satisfactorily—but there is no indication that they are operating at overload, due to the fact that a rubber-engineering components plant, bakery, and other city facilities are switched on as well.

The speaker labeled as groundless assertions to the effect that there is no legal documentation to support the military's use of lands for forestry. Land-use documents with precise boundary indications for the land sections are classified secret and kept in the billeting and operations administration of the military district. They may be produced upon request.

Latvian Draft Law on Ethnic Group Rights

90UN0845A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 6 Jan 90 p 3

[Draft law proposed by the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet: "On the Rights of Ethnic Groups of the Latvian SSR"]

[Text] There live in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [LaSSR] the Latvian nation, ancient people from time immemorial—the Livonians—and other ethnic groups which together comprise the people of Latvia. They are the subject of the sovereign rights of the republic.

In accordance with the LaSSR Constitution, the people of Latvia independently exercise on their territory such legislative and executive authority as to provide for the development and flourishing of the Latvian nation and of all national and ethnic groups living in Latvia.

The ethnic rights of all citizens of the LaSSR can be guaranteed if the right of the Latvian nation to self-determination is secured.

The Latvian SSR guarantees all national and ethnic groups the right to cultural autonomy and cultural self-rule. People belonging to national and ethnic groups who have tied in their lives with Latvia, and with her future, have certain legal rights and responsibilities.

This law is adopted in order to establish legal guarantees of equal rights for all inhabitants of the LaSSR and of satisfying their national and cultural needs, in order to unite the interests of the Latvian nation and all national groups toward attaining the sovereignty of Latvia and the development of her economy and culture.

1. Citizens of the LaSSR, irrespective of their ethnic affiliation, are guaranteed equal political, economic, and social rights.

2. Each citizen of the LaSSR has the right, being guided by his ethnic self-consciousness, to choose, identify, and restore his ethnic affiliation in the records of civil statutes.

The law prohibits any activity whose purpose is to compel a citizen to change his ethnic affiliation or restrict his choice.

3. The organs of LaSSR state authority and rule bear responsibility for preserving the national identity and cultural- historical environment of the ancient people of Latvia from time immemorial, the Livonians, and for the restoration and development of the socioeconomic infrastructure in the historical region of this ethnos along the Kurzemskoye coast of the Baltic Sea.

4. Representatives of national and ethnic groups of Latvia are guaranteed the right to be nominated and introduced as candidates in elections to organs of state authority at all levels on the basis of universal, equal, and direct electoral right.

5. The LaSSR guarantees all inhabitants of the republic, irrespective of their ethnic affiliation, equal rights to work and work remuneration. Any activity which directly or indirectly restricts, on the basis of ethnic affiliation, opportunities to choose an occupation or occupy any job position in accordance with one's capabilities and qualifications, is prohibited.

6. All inhabitants of the LaSSR are guaranteed the right to form their own ethnic societies, groupings, and associations, and these have the status of corporate person. It is the duty of state organs to facilitate their activity and provide them material conditions.

7. It is the duty of ethnic societies, groupings, and associations to function within the framework of the laws of the LaSSR, respect the sovereignty and integrity of Latvia, and protect the common interests of the people of Latvia.

Activity of ethnic societies, groupings, or associations which contradicts the Constitution or other legislative acts of the LaSSR will be suspended according to procedure as established by law.

8. Representatives of ethnic societies and associations are guaranteed the right to participate in the work of the Consultative Soviet of Nationalities of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet.

9. Social organizations—ethnic societies and associations—may nominate their own candidates for deputy at elections to the organs of LaSSR state power in accordance with the laws on elections of deputies.

10. All inhabitants of the LaSSR are guaranteed the right to observe their ethnic and religious rituals, to use their own national symbolism, to celebrate ethnic holidays and preserve their traditions.

11. The organs of state authority and government of the LaSSR guarantee all inhabitants of the republic the right to freely maintain contacts with their historical motherland and other people from that motherland outside the territory of the LaSSR, and also the right, according to procedure as established by law, to leave at their desire and take up permanent residence in their historical motherland.

12. LaSSR state organs are responsible for safeguarding the ethnic-cultural interests of inhabitants of the republic, and for establishing the appropriate conditions for development of the language and culture of all national and ethnic groups living in the territory of the LaSSR. Special appropriations are allocated in the LaSSR budget for the cultural development of ethnic groups.

13. All inhabitants of the LaSSR, irrespective of their ethnic affiliation, are guaranteed the right to receive a general secondary-school education in the Latvian or Russian language, according to their free choice.

14. State organs of the LaSSR guarantee permanent residents of the republic, irrespective of their ethnic affiliation, the opportunity to receive vocational training, and also provide the opportunity to obtain a secondary or higher level specialized education in the Latvian or Russian language in accordance with the laws of the LaSSR.

15. State organs of the LaSSR undertake measures using budgetary means to gradually satisfy the needs of ethnic groups in establishing ethnic general-education schools, Sunday schools and classes, and preschool children's institutions, and in providing free instruction here through special programs to learn the native language and obtain knowledge of one's ethnic history, literature, and art.

Ethnic societies also have the right to establish ethnic cultural centers and training institutions using their own funding. Programs and diplomas (certificates) from such training institutions are approved by the organs of state government in accordance with the laws of the LaSSR.

16. Based on inter-republic and international agreements, LaSSR state organs assist citizens of the republic in obtaining higher education in their native language outside the territory of the LaSSR.

17. State organs of the LaSSR facilitate and financially support the publication and procurement of national periodicals and literature, coverage of cultural life through the mass media, and the development of ethnic professional and amateur fine arts, music, theater, and screen.

18. Monuments and objects of history and culture of all national communities on the territory of the LaSSR are protected by the state.

19. Any insult to an individual's national sensitivities is prohibited.

Any activity which creates an inequality in ethnic rights, or any declaration of ethnic superiority, hatred, or contempt will be punished by law.
[signed] Chairman of the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet

Secretary of the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Completes Work 15 Feb

Pursuing Independence Course

PM1602112590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Feb 90 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondent Captain Third Rank V. Yermolin report: "Lithuania: Following Course of Delimitation"]

[Text] Vilnius, 15 Feb—The 17th Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Session completed its work in Vilnius yesterday. Practically all the main items on the agenda were examined.

The first document adopted at the session was the republic Supreme Soviet resolution "On the 1939 Soviet-German Treaties and the Elimination of Their Consequences for Lithuania." In this document the Supreme Soviet announces that the Lithuanian People's Seimas declaration of 21 July 1940 on Lithuania's incorporation in the USSR "does not express the will of the Lithuanian people and is illegal and invalid, while the USSR Law "On the Lithuanian SSR's Admission to the USSR" of 3 August 1940 is illegal and not legally binding on Lithuania. [Quotation marks as published] The final point in the resolution reads as follows: "To propose that the Soviet Union embark on bilateral talks on restoring the independence of the Lithuanian state."

The adopted document subsequently became a kind of "juridical reference point." It was with regard to it that the draft changes and additions to the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, the draft law on the fundamentals of local self-management, the draft laws on the fundamentals of ownership, on a Lithuanian Bank, on the press, on archives, on the judiciary and the legal status of judges, and others were examined. A definite orientation toward the 1939 model of Lithuanian statehood can also be perceived in the very terminology enshrined in the prospective documents: magistrates, mayors, police...

At the 14 February morning session a two-hour debate on the question of military service ended in the adoption of the resolution "On the Status of the USSR Armed Forces in the Republic and on Military Service in the Army by Citizens of the Lithuanian SSR." It states, in particular: "Point one: It is to be stated that the presence of the USSR Armed Forces on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR is juridically unfounded. Point two: A state commission is to be formed and entrusted with preparing proposals before 1 April 1990 concerning the status of the USSR Armed Forces in the Lithuanian SSR, as well as alternative (labor) military service for the republic's citizens, and submitting them to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Point three: It is to be announced that any actions by the Armed Forces which might impede the legislative and executive power of the Lithuanian SSR are viewed as interference in the internal affairs of the Lithuanian SSR...."

This is the course....

Supreme Soviet Issues Appeal

LD1502120790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1645 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Lithuanian Supreme Soviet appeal, read by session chairman L. Sepetys at the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session held in Vilnius—live]

[Text] We, the deputies of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation, concluding our work of five years, appeal to the residents of Lithuania—Lithuanians and Russians, Poles and Jews, Belorussians and Ukrainians, Tartars and Karaims, and representatives of all other nationalities, believers and atheists, members of all parties and movements.

Dear people of Lithuania, we urge you to unite and work in striving for the common aim—a better and happier life in the Lithuanian state, which is being restored, which would ensure all civic rights and freedoms, national harmony, social justice and well-being. All of Lithuania sees what the present Supreme Soviet has accomplished. This will be evaluated by history. We had to work in complicated times in the reviving of Lithuania; we were maturing together with the people. We thank you for the trust placed in us by you, the electors, whose hopes we endeavored to realize.

The new elections to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet will take place in a week's time. Lithuania's future, its further democratization, the restoration of independence, or the threat of economic and political disintegration, will depend on the deputies you elect. We hope the new parliament will justify the hopes of the people of Lithuania, and with its considered and important solutions, will pave the way toward the statehood of Lithuania. We hope you will elect honest and hardworking people as deputies, deputies who will be resolved to work for the benefit of the restoration of Lithuania.

TASS Reviews Supreme Soviet Decisions

LD1502125890 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 15 Feb 90

[Text] Vilnius February 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila:

The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session that ended its work on Wednesday was unprecedented in the history of this Soviet Baltic republic for the importance of the problems discussed.

The session discussed a record 26 issues. Elections to the new soviet will be held in ten days time.

The deputies adopted a resolution on Soviet-German 1939 treaties and overcoming their consequences for Lithuania. The resolution declares "illegal and invalid" the declaration of the Lithuanian People's Parliament of July 21, 1940 on joining the Soviet Union.

The document also states that the law of the USSR on the inclusion of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic into the USSR of August 3, 1940 based on the declaration, is "illegal and legally not obligatory for Lithuania".

The republic's Supreme Soviet has proposed to the Soviet Union "bilateral negotiations on restoring the Lithuanian state's sovereignty".

The law on property adopted by the session is aimed at considerable changes in economic relations in the republic. Along with state and collective property already existing in the republic, the law legalises private property and guarantees equal rights to its owners.

The session has adopted the law on the press and other mass media, the first such law in the Soviet Union. It determines that "mass media are free and not subjected to censorship. Any interference in their activities connected with preparing and spreading information, is forbidden".

The republican Supreme Soviet has discussed a package of issues to improve the activities of the law enforcement system. It has adopted a law on the legal system and the status of judges. Corresponding amendments and additions have been introduced in the republican constitution, legalising the independence of the public prosecution bodies.

A state central republican bank—Lietuvos Bankas—has been set up. According to the adopted law, it "has the exclusive right to put into circulation republican money". The republic's supreme body has granted the right to the bank to "set up its affiliates abroad and to participate in international banking organisations".

The session has discussed the status of the Soviet Army in the republic and Lithuanian young men's service in it. It has decided to set up a state commission to "prepare suggestions for the status of the USSR Armed Forces in Lithuania and for military and alternative (labour) service of the republic's citizens".

Many cathedrals, abbeys and other buildings belonging to church, religious organisations and societies were confiscated after the Second World War. The Supreme Soviet has cancelled legislative acts connected with the issue and obliged local authorities, ministries, departments, enterprises and organisations to return the confiscated property. It is decided, particularly, to return the resurrection cathedral in Kaunas to believers by the end of 1993.

Brazauskas Delivers Independence Day Speech

LD1502230190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 15 February broadcasts a 35-minute live speech by Algirdas Brazauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium, at Vilnius Opera House on 15 February, to mark the occasion of the restoration of Lithuania's independence on 16 February 1918.

Brazauskas starts his speech as follows: "Esteemed and dear people of Lithuania, the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet which ended its session this week adopted a document proclaiming 16 February, the day of the restoration of the Lithuanian state, as the state holiday. I think that we can firmly state that this event will remain in our history, that it will be remembered also by the generations which will live after us and to which we will entrust our work and aims. Therefore allow me to greet you, the participants in this soiree and all the people in Lithuania, from the bottom of my heart on the occasion of this holiday which is dear to all of us."

Brazauskas goes on to say: "Today we state to ourselves and to all people that we have come to this festival to restore independent and free Lithuania. These are not abstract words. This is testified by constructive actions. Such a brief period of time has passed, and look how the regeneration started in our country. The path traversed by us is equal to that traversed in decades." He adds: "Would we feel today the spirit of holiday if we had not proclaimed a very important document—the declaration on Lithuania's state sovereignty? I do not think so. This document strengthens the confidence of our people, helps them to overcome the submissiveness and fear which they experienced for many years. The declaration which we regard with justification as an act of spiritual independence, expresses the will of the people to build the Lithuanian state with our own efforts and our laws".

Brazauskas continues: "On the eve of this holiday the Republican Supreme Soviet, wishing to restore historical justice, made yet another very important step. It announced to everyone that the declaration by the people's sejmas on 21 July 1940 on Lithuania joining the Soviet Union, as not expressing the will of the Lithuanian people, was illegal and invalid. The documents about which the whole world knows now, created a completely new political and legal situation. Now we are facing a fundamentally new stage: negotiations to establish qualitatively new relations based on state equality, goodwill, and mutually advantageous cooperation. We say this because we are deeply convinced that nobody can deny the right of any nation to self-determination and a free and independent life. Nobody can take away the right to a nation to solve independently, without any external dictate, all its internal and external policy problems. The negotiations, sooner or later, but unavoidably, will start."

After reviewing Lithuania's history under Soviet rule, Brazauskas says: "We are glad that the path toward regeneration and toward the independent state has been and is supported by our emigres, Lithuanians whom fate has separated from our country. We are united once again and we say to them today: Accept, dear brothers and sisters, our heartfelt greetings on the occasion of 16 February, the date which you have never forgotten, just like you have never forgotten your native Lithuania."

He goes on: "Lithuania as a state cannot move to another part of the earth or to space. It cannot break off vital ties which have lasted for centuries, with Eastern and Western neighbors. We understand this as a necessity patiently and wisely strive for our aim and as a great responsibility. We are for a Lithuania which will maintain friendly and mutually advantageous relations with friendly disposed countries in the name of harmony among the peoples. We are Europeans and therefore we are for Lithuania occupying a proper place in the European home."

"The new Lithuania which we are building," he goes on to say, "must be not only independent, but a modern, legal state of mature humanist culture. It must be stable not only politically but also economically."

He adds: "Having chosen the peaceful and constitutional parliamentary path of development, we have already made a few steps forward to creating a legal state. And we did it not only so that the times of Stalinist licence would never return. We understand well that such a state is essential for us where all social life is governed only by law."

He continues: "On this occasion I would like to stress the following: Already now we have to form a basically new concept of Lithuania's Constitution, draw up a long term program of preparing the most important economic and political laws, prepare a new mechanism of economic functioning which should be based on economic and financial levers, the rules of market and competition. It is very important that the laws which are being drawn up create legal conditions for man to express his initiative and independence, his creative abilities. Our firm aim must be a humanist attitude, Lithuania must become a homeland for everyone who is friendly disposed toward work for its future. In creating the future, Lithuania we are firmly convinced that it must be a state with political pluralism and the institutions which serve man, help to develop his creative forces and create conditions to live in prosperity."

He goes on to ask: Do we have sufficient means to be economically strong? I think, yes. We have qualified experts, workers, peasants, experienced production leaders, rapidly increasing scientific and technical potential, a developed power industry and building industry, comparatively rationally-spread industrial capacities. According to USSR standards we are leading in the development of agriculture and in the solution of the countryside's social problems."

After describing in detail Lithuania's dependence on the supply of raw material and materials from the Soviet Union, Brazauskas states: "It is clear that the inviolable priority in Lithuania's economic policy and its primary principle must be thrift." He goes on to say: We will be able substantially to increase Lithuania's economic effectiveness only through the denationalization and privatization of the Republic's economy, through the reorganization of the systems of prices, taxes, finances and credits, through managing the emission of our own money and the policy of tariffs.

Brazauskas continues: "Although the first outlines of democratic life are apparent, there is openness and pluralism of opinions, a multiparty system, ever more people are able effectively to contribute to the solution of the most important problems, there still is a substantial political tension. It is increased by a very unfavorable ecological, social, economic, moral and criminological situation. We cannot help seeing that there are instances of exaggerated anxiety and suspicion, hatred, and the desire to square accounts. We cannot allow that discord, mutual squabbles, and anarchy take the upper hand."

After quoting a letter published in the press about anxiety concerning Lithuania's future, he says: "If we are wise, our national culture will be reborn, the relations between the church and the state will be good, there will be freedom of conscience."

He goes on to say: "We will be tolerant, so that people of other nationalities have a good life together with Lithuanians." He adds: "If we are hard working and inventive, we will achieve faster economic, social, and ecological well-being. Independence and well-being cannot be separate."

He ends his speech saying: "Let our steps be illuminated always by clear wisdom and sensitive hearts, let our hardworking hands always reliably work for you, dear Lithuania."

Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Member on Plenum Results

PM1402110390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 First Edition p 1

[Commentary by V. Shved, secretary of the interim Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (on the CPSU Platform) under the general headline: "Time for Reflection and Action. We Continue To Inform Readers About Participants' First Impressions of the Work of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum"]

[Text] I would call this plenum an extraordinary event. In terms of a whole range of the problems raised it seems to go beyond the fixed framework of former plenums by resolving them at congress level, whether we are talking about economics or the future of the party. A great deal was discussed very frankly and bluntly. Many controversial issues and issues that are the topic of debate in society were stressed. This applies to article six of the Constitution, a multiparty system, intraparty life, and other issues. It seems to me that this will give the party a second wind and will help it to become more united and carry out its perestroyka policy more resolutely.

The question of a multiparty system, for example. It is now de facto, so to speak. And we must recognize this. And by taking into account the prevailing reality we can formulate the tactics and adopt the goals which will enable the CPSU to be the real vanguard of Soviet society. The crucial nature of such conclusions and assessments promotes optimism.

Now, about my attitude to the timing of the 28th Party Congress. The congress will be in the summer, that is simple. We just have to go back to how we arrived at that decision. After all, we—the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform—the "isolated" Communist Party of Lithuania, and other party organizations in the country supported this. And the plenum made the decision. The situation in the country is changing quickly, and we must scrutinize events on a more timely basis. And, even better—to predict their development. Incidentally, we sometimes forget that during Lenin's lifetime congresses were convened almost every year, and it was justified at that time, as the situation was dictated by politics. I believe that our times are similar.

The plenum has justified our hopes. Our views and intentions received support. The document on this was adopted at the plenum, and it was adopted unanimously. Of course, there were rebukes and criticisms, but, I repeat, there was full support. But I will say frankly that the joy caused by this is mingled with bitterness. A split is a split—everyone is the loser. Yes, an assessment has been made, the assessment is unequivocal, and this gladdens us. I would like the plenum appeal to the Lithuanian Communists to be heard by everyone and to fulfill its constructive role. We must not close the door to the members of the autonomous Communist Party of Lithuania. We must let people think and understand—after all, it will be much easier for us to go forward together. Personally, I have always defended the interests of Lithuania. It is my motherland, but on no account do I separate these interests from the interests of, say, Russia, for example.

Many people are interested in how the structure of the two parties in Lithuania looks today. Taking advantage of this opportunity, I will answer. There are two of everything. Central Committees, rayon party committees, bureaus.... But we act autonomously on a whole range of questions. This concerns registration and party admission, and to some extent we are violating the Statutes. We menioned this at the plenum, stressing that this is necessary if we want to preserve in Lithuania a Communist Party on the CPSU platform.

The membership figures for both Lithuanian Communist Parties were cited at the news conference. We have around 35,000, while the autonomous party has 70,000. What about the rest?

Around 100,000 Communists have not yet determined their position. And it is not out of the question that some of them will not find their position, and will leave and turn in their party membership cards. The logic of a split is a hard one. But there is problem of another kind—we must attract people to the CPSU platform. I hope that the clarity and precision of the plenum's assessments will play a consolidating role.

Attempt To Smuggle 'CS' Gas Into Lithuania

LD1402174390 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Text] A warning issued by the press bureau of the Lithuanian State Security Committee says that large quantities of poisonous gas brought into Lithuania is considered to be smuggling and is punishable by law [sentence as heard]. A West German sailor was detained in Klaipeda, the port city of Lithuania, in December, who tried to smuggle 260 bottles of CS gas into the city.

Plans of Kishinev Anti-Russian Pogroms Rumored

LD1602114590 Moscow World Service in Russian 1040 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Interfax correspondent report from Kishinev]

[Text] Persistent rumors are circulating in Kishinev that Weapons are coming in from neighboring Romania for anti-Russian pogroms being prepared in the city. The correspondent was told at the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs that there is no foundation for these rumors. However, the correpondent stressed, the Moldavian mass information media have declined to refute these rumors. The population of the republic is extremly worried by the deepening interethnic conflicts, the Interfax correspondent reports.

Weapons Sales, Pogroms in Moldavia Denied

90US0535A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 1 Feb 90 p 2

[Report on ATEM interview with Moldavian KGB official: "Be in No Haste To Spread Rumors"]

[Text] Rumors and a variety of fabrications about pogroms which are allegedly in preparation and about the fact that certain groups of people are arming and freely trading in firearms have been spreading recently in Kishinev and other cities and villages of the republic. All this is destabilizing the already complex social and political situation and introducing edginess to the activity of the work force and people's mood. A Moldavian Press Agency correspondent requested that D.Kh. Muntyan, first deputy chairman of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic KGB, describe what is being done to check out these rumors which are stirring up the population. This is what he said.

Each such incident is investigated. Although this takes up much time and effort, nothing is left without thorough verification. Here is an example. There was talk a week ago in the Vulkaneshty community of instances of the sale of weapons to the population. Our men immediately tracked down the source of this information. As a result they reached citizen L.V. Nesterova, who said that she had heard about this in a conversation between her husband, Yu.A. Nesterov, and L.V. Parush, an official of an interfarm construction association. They, in turn, cited a conversation which I.V. Uzun, an official of this organization, was having with associates at the site of a community bathhouse which is under construction. His attempts to deflect suspicion from himself concerning the spreading of these fabrications were unsuccessful. The persons he named as allegedly knowing of instances of the sale of submachine guns from the trunk of a "Zhiguli" automobile flatly denied this. Uzun had no recourse other than to declare that he had "forgotten" from whom he had learned these facts concerning the sale of firearms. This indicates that he deliberately or unthinkingly was himself the spreader of this rumor.

Our men had to investigate a rumor which also reached Kishinev to the effect that Georgiy Zhosan, a resident of the village of Redoay of Lazovskiy Rayon, had imported for sale a crate containing assault rifles and live rounds. The following detail was even reported: He lives not far from the village soviet and is awaiting customers. But, upon inspection, it turned out that there was no such inhabitant in the village of Redoay.

Perplexity, to say the least, is caused by the fact that playing the part of spreaders of such information in the capital of the republic are people whom one would have thought would have been putting a decisive stop to them. I will cite you the following instance. In his speech on 21 January this year in the city Officers House to veterans of the Great Patriotic War, V.G. Kovalev, chief of civil defense of the Kishinev State Union Planning Institute, reported that he had reliable information concerning the training of groups of militants in two rural localities. These militants, according to him, had been assembled in specialized army formations—battalions and companies—and were undergoing strenuous training. This was sufficient for his credulous audience literally in a matter of hours to have spread this horrifying news not only around Kishinev, but Tiraspol and Bendery as well. An enterprise in Bendery even hit upon "warning" the work force about this over the plant intercom. It is no wonder that such a report excited people and lent the rumor a veneer of plausibility.

In conversation with us V.G. Kovalev attempted to confirm the soundness of his speech, but declined to name the source of the information or, at least, the villages where such formations were being "trained," which would have been sufficient for a check. He referred to the fact that he had to "confer with comrades" and then informed us by telephone that they had prohibited him divulging this "secret." Is this not deliberate disinformation on Kovalev's part? I would like to inquire as to whether he and his ilk understand the danger of such irresponsible statements.

Many of those who with malice aforethought are concocting and then throwing out a variety of inventions themselves prefer to remain in the shadows and, instead of themselves, set up other people. G.V. Surikova of the "Moldgiproprom" and pensioner A.V. Tatarina, residents of Kishinev, for example, fell victim to such insinuation. They were extremely surprised when an officer of ours asked them to explain on what they based the rumors they had been spreading concerning the sale of weapons and armed pogroms in Orgeyev and concerning the fact that Russians and Jews had been beaten up here on 26 January. It was established that they were doing nothing of the sort and that neither woman had any inkling of such things.

None of the above cases have the least foundation. The sole incident which, as a check showed, did actually occur was the scattering of leaflets from an aircraft over Tiraspol. But there was exaggeration here also. It was said that this was done from military aircraft and helicopters, but in fact an AN-2 aircraft, which the people call a "kukuruznik," belonging to the Tiraspol Aviation-Sports Club of the DOSAAF [All-Union Voluntary Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force, and Navy] Central Committee, flew over the city. This is being investigated.

In conclusion I would like to say that the KGB has always been greatly attentive to the working people's submissions and checks out all deserving cases. I therefore request of the republic's inhabitants that before spreading information heard from an unofficial source and sharing it with a neighbor or comrade at work, the correct thing would be to confer with us. We can be contacted in person or by telephone: 23-45-32.

Moldavian Party Reviews Events in Tiraspol

90US0527A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 27 Jan 90 p 1

[Text] Having been briefed by L.V. Tsurkan, first secretary of the Tiraspol Gorkom [city party committee], and V.A. Kudryavtsev, chairman of the Tiraspol Gorispolkom [city soviet Executive committee], on the situation which has taken shape in the city, the Central Committee Bureau observed that many communists and nonparty people, primary party organizations, and the work force had recently taken active steps to stabilize the situation in the city and prevent an escalation of interethnic discord and an increase in tension. Many working people and the population understand the futility of a policy of confrontation, are unwilling to be dragged into political adventures, and are demanding that the party and soviet authorities take practical steps to stabilize the situation.

The members of the gorkom, communist deputies of the city soviet, and the leaders of enterprises and organizations should, when tackling central problems of the republic, understand that vagueness of position and political maneuvering cannot lead to a normalization of the situation. The decision to hold on 28 January of this year a referendum in the City of Tiraspol, and also the poll of inhabitants of the City of Rybnitsa on autonomy conducted earlier, do not contribute to a removal of the accumulated problems and merely serve as a catalyst for an exacerbation of the already difficult social and political situation in the republic.

Some primary party organizations are failing to draw conclusions from the current situation, not making a scrupulous appraisal of the state of the moral and psychological atmosphere in the work force, continuing to put up with instances of interethnic discord, and failing to pay proper attention to instances of a deviation from the standards of party life and the flagrant violations by certain communists of party discipline.

The Central Committee Bureau considers all trends toward separatism, exclusiveness, spiritual isolation, and demarcation of people on a national basis contradictory to the processes of restructuring and renewal. Exacerbation of the social and political situation does not correspond to the interests and cherished aspirations of the peoples living in the republic and does not contribute to the surmounting of the deformations and negative phenomena of the past. Confrontation, alienation, the fomenting of passions are a hopeless venture and a path leading to impasse. The referendum scheduled in the city for 28 January cannot solve the accumulated problems. The Tiraspol Gorkom (L.V. Tsurkan) and the communist deputies of the city soviet of people's deputies (V.A. Kudryavtsev) are instructed to adopt decisive measures to forestall trends leading to a deterioration in the political situation in the city. It is essential that the communist leaders clearly define their position and emphatically and publicly rebuff all antisocial manifestations.

It is recommended that the gorkom and the communists of the city party organization implement measures for the establishment of practical cooperation with the organizations and public movements occupying constructive positions and conduct explanatory work among the populace for the purpose of the consolidation of forces and the creation of a tranquil, businesslike atmosphere in the city and in each outfit.

It was noted that the deputy group of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet is continuing work on study of the particular features of the application in individual regions of the republic of laws on the functioning of languages for the purpose of their further improvement.

Moldavian Party on Disturbances in Capital

90US0529A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 1 Feb 90 pp 1, 2

[ATEM correspondent report: "Meeting in the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting held in the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee between Ye.V. Sobor and the leaders of the republic's artistic unions and deans and secretaries of the party organizations of higher educational institutions of Kishinev was devoted to discussion of the social and political situation which has taken shape in the republic and its capital.

It was observed that a trend toward the regular staging on days off of unauthorized marches through the city streets had emerged recently in the republic's capital, and this was leading to serious disturbances of public order, a sharp deterioration in relations between people, and a further destabilization of the situation. The movement of public transport is being interrupted for several hours on the central route. This is exasperating the citizens, ruining their leisure time, and preventing various activities. It has been determined that during such marches ambulances are late reaching an average of 20-25 of the patients to whom they have been called.

The devotees of "street democracy" are unwilling to pay heed to elementary standards of behavior and the interests of other members of society. Together with perestroyka slogans, on whose implementation the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic government are working at this time, categorical demands and irresponsible calls having nothing in common with the principles of genuine democracy and glasnost are being heard. This was the case also on 28

January, when, following a meeting of the A. Mateyevich Club, a group of people arranged an unauthorized march and attempted to organize a mass meeting in the city center. They were shouting out antigovernment, inflammatory slogans and calling for the overthrow of the existing system, outright violence, and reprisals against the communists. Such actions are stirring up the population, giving rise to the most absurd rumors, and introducing edginess into the activity of the work force.

It was emphasized at the meeting that recent events were largely a consequence of the low cultural level of some people. For this reason figures of culture and art should intensify their role in the education of the masses and participate actively in the shaping of public opinion and in controlling it. Higher educational institution leaders should pay particular attention to the inculcation in the youth of a clear position in life and a correct world outlook and to the forms and methods of education of the students.

The participants in the meeting condemned the attempts to revise the republic's territorial borders and the unconstitutional referendum conducted on 28 January in Tiraspol.

Moldavian Official on Gagauz Autonomy

90US0526A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 1 Feb 90 p 3

[Report on interview with V.S. Pushkash, deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, by B. Boyko; place and date not given: "Does Budzhak Need Autonomy?"]

[Text] A special congress of representatives of the Gagauz people which was held last November-December adopted a declaration and a number of other documents in which it expressed the demand for the formation of a Gagauz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] within the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. This question had been posed earlier also. However, it has yet to be resolved, although much attention has been paid to study thereof by a special commission of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and its working groups and the local and republic press. On why this has been the case and the factors delaying a final solution of the problems of Gagauz autonomy our correspondent interviewed V.S. Pushkash, deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium commission for study of the questions of people's deputies and other appeals pertaining to the creation of autonomy for the Gagauz people.

[Boyko] Viktor Stepanovich, permit me to start our discussion with a question which, possibly, would have been more appropriate at the end of our meeting: Will a law on the formation of some Gagauz autonomous national-territorial formation—republic, oblast, rayon—be enacted?

[Pushkash] Only the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium or the Supreme Soviet itself can answer this question. I, on the other hand, have the right to express merely my own viewpoint, which, naturally, should in no way influence the essence of the decision which will be adopted by the highest organ of state power.

[Boyko] So, your viewpoint....

[Pushkash] Before having emphasized the problem of autonomization, the authors of projects thereof should, I profoundly believe, have scrupulously, fully, and without a shadow of prejudice studied the conditions permitting or not permitting the creation of Gagauz autonomy on the land of Budzhak. It should meanwhile be recognized that there are more conditions which do not permit, conditions, I stress, which are objective and convincing. I shall not enumerate them all, I will recall the most striking, so to speak.

When we speak of some national-territorial state formation, we imagine a region whose population is at least three-fourths, or even 60 percent, composed of representatives of one nation. This is not the case in Budzhak. Here are some statistics. Some 288,000 people, of whom 136,000 are Gagauz, that is, less than half, reside on the territory of the five rayons of the proposed autonomous region.

[Boyko] If, however, more than half does not object to autonomy....

[Pushkash] The point is that it does. And this, as is known, is an obstacle to the adoption of a decision on autonomization. I would add to this that for solution of the question of autonomization the laws requires the approval of the majority of both the whole population and the main, that is, Moldavian, population. We have received a multitude of letters and decisions of rural gatherings, mass meetings, and meetings from all areas of the republic, whose population is opposed to autonomy, signed by tens of thousands of people.

Nor does the proposition concerning the high density of the settlement of the Gagauz, who, I would note in passing, are preponderant in terms of numbers only in two out of the five rayons—Komratskiy and Chadyr-Lungskiy—where they constitute approximately 64 percent of the population, bear criticism.

[Boyko] But how in those same percentages do the individual villages, rather than the rayons as a whole, look?

[Pushkash] Just as a patchwork. In fact, only 27 (out of 93) localities in all five rayons are Gagauz. And many citizens speaking a different language, considerable numbers of whom are categorically against the autonomization of the region, are residents even there. Consequently, even here there is no expression of the wishes of the whole population, without which, I repeat, autonomy is impossible.

[Boyko] Twenty-seven localities with a relatively full national density.... How many Gagauz actually live there?

[Pushkash] Approximately 101,000. More than 120,000 altogether live around Komrat and Chadyr-Lunga, where the Gagauz are densely located.

[Boyko] Is the creation of a state formation realistic, given such numbers of the population?

[Pushkash] In my opinion, it is not. Judge for yourself. A nation is needed for the creation of a state formation. And a nation, according to Lenin, is a human community in which, other things being equal, there should be more than 1 million people.

In a word, there are more than enough objective obstacles to the proclamation of an autonomous republic in the south of Moldavia. Many arise also on the path of ideas of the organization of other forms of national-territorial autonomy. I refer to the economic relations, social structures, and so forth which have taken shape in the republic.

[Boyko] "Gagauz khalky" activists are insisting on the need for the autonomization of Budzhak precisely because the life of the Gagauz outside of an autonomous region has led to their socioeconomic and cultural backwardness. What can be said about this?

[Pushkash] Not can, should. Such statements are more often than not political speculation aimed at the gullible.

The Gagauz have truly lagged behind in some respects. There are many difficulties in the development of language, national culture, and the economy. But this is not the result of an absence of autonomy but the consequences of the deformation of Lenin's nationality policy in the years of Stalinism and stagnation, that is, in the times which were most negatively reflected in the state of the language, culture, and traditions of all peoples of the country. Both those who had their own statehood and those who did not. The experience of state building in the USSR shows that neither the material living standard nor the state of national culture depend on the forms of state formation. So today, during the period of perestroyka, all of us together—Moldavians and Russians, Gagauz and Bulgarians, Ukrainians, Jews, and all others—need to work on the revival of our peoples.

[Boyko] Nonetheless, what will happen regarding the autonomy of the Gagauz?

[Pushkash] The commission mentioned at the start of our discussion has completed its work, but has not reached an unambiguous conclusion. The collected material has been handed to the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. And we will not, I believe, have to wait long for the answer. We also, it seems to me, will receive it immediately after the draft law "Free National Development of USSR Citizens Living Within Their National-State Formations or Without Such on USSR Territory" which provides for guarantees of such development in all walks of life, has become a law of the USSR.

[Boyko] And until then?

[Pushkash] Let us work calmly, adopt a respectful attitude toward one another, listen closely to one another, and remember that only a wise decision is capable of preserving a people.

Afanasyev Interviewed on Baltics, Gorbachev

90UN0880A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 18 Jan 90 p 2

[Interview with Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev, USSR people's deputy and vice-chancellor of the Moscow Historical Archival Institute, by journalists in Tallinn, reported by G. Rozenshteyn: "Recognizing the Ordinary Man of Culture"]

[Text][Journalist] Permit us to ask you a personal question: What was the end of the "Noginsk story"? This is not only of concern to journalists.

[Afanasyev] It had a sad ending. After six weeks of strike, first the Moscow Oblast court and then the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Court ruled that the Noginsk newspaper was illegal. There was no justification for this because the entire editorial offices, with the exception of one person, took part in the strike. It was a political strike and it could not be considered on the basis of the law on labor conflicts.

The Noginsk Gorkom [city party committee] displayed—there is no other word—real treachery by firing Puchkov, the newspaper editor, because he published an article by the people's deputy for that electoral okrug, Yu. Afanasyev, that is, he published my material. It was a violation of the Constitution, and it was a violation of the resolution of the First Congress of People's Deputies. Nevertheless, in both the oblast and the republic courts these decisions, illegal in the eyes of all the people, were rubber-stamped to the accompaniment of talk about glasnost and movement toward the law-governed state. The result was that the entire editorial staff was fired and the collective completely replaced. The newspaper being published is in the pocket of the party gorkom. People are not their business. A sad ending for all of us.

[Journalist] How, in your opinion, do the Russian people relate to the desire of the Lithuanians and other numerically small people for freedom?

[Afanasyev] I think that their attitudes differ in different places and at the different levels of the hierarchy or social ladder. I have often spoken with people in the public life who perceive everything that is being done in the Baltics as a real fresh wind and as a desire by those peoples finally to be sovereign and gain national independence. What is given out as a standard for the entire civilized world is a problem, an unresolved issue, for our Baltic and other republics. And therefore, of course, very many Russians are siding with the transformations that are taking place in the Baltic area. But by no means all. One proof of this was the Second Congress of People's Deputies, which failed to deal with the "Baltic syndrome." This syndrome was felt every day at the Congress, and the majority was unable to cope with it. They disapproved of what is happening in the Baltic and perceived events inadequately. The intentions of the Balts were perceived as hostile, unfriendly, unjust. And all of this was not so much deliberately spoken of at the Congress, but rather became something emotional, in the form of catcalling, clapping, commotion, and displays of collective dissatisfaction. I make bold to say that for me, a Russian, and for those Russians, who were, unfortunately, in the majority, this was shameful.

[Journalist] What will happen if Gorbachev does not succeed in retaining power?

[Afanasyev] I think that this is not the proper question. The question does not arise at this time. And so guessing is a not a very honorable thing. Gorbachev is not threatened with anything like the kind of thing that happened, for example, to Khrushchev. And now this is in principle impossible. What does it mean not to retain power? It means that we give up on the line that is linked to the name of Gorbachev. It means that we cancel out the desire of millions and millions of people, both in the USSR and throughout the entire world. There would hardly be forces that would be brave enough to undertake anything along those lines.

Even though we know that at Central Committee plenums people have spoken against Gorbachev and against the line. But we must bear in mind the fact that these forces are essentially not adequately expressing the sentiments and interests of society, the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

I do not therefore think that the question can be posed this way. Of course, the danger always exists. Everyone thinks: How will Gorbachev behave, where will the process go? This is considered by the most varied kinds of people, and unfortunately many of his fellow-thinkers have lost their faith both in Gorbachev and his line, as they observe that since 1988 he has been moving to the right along with the corrections to the general line of both the Central Committee and the government. What is the reason for this? I am not really sure. I think that the main reason for this kind of development of political events is that the political space to the left of Gorbachev has remained very amorphous and disorganized. And even though the wishes and good intentions in this space can be seen quite clearly, for them to be embodied in political actions a quite high degree of organization and cohesion and joint actions is needed. The more that Gorbachev influences the center and the left, the more, it seems to me he will reflect accurately everything that is taking place in our society.

[Journalist] You returned recently from Vorkuta. What was the purpose of your visit?

[Afanasyev] It was in response to an invitation from people at Vorkuta—some of their independent organizations and the strike committee. I met both with the strike committee and the party-and-economic aktiv, and also visited the "Vargashorskaya" mine. It was cold—minus 37 degrees. The mood was very contradictory. On the one hand there was reason for rejoicing because the miners had supposedly won—they now have economic, management, and financial independence. But there is also chagrin mixed with the rejoicing. It is difficult to say what they will gain, or that the mining sector can now breathe freely. They have a shortage of wagons for the coal and those that they do have are in bad condition, not clean and so forth. True, the miners are in a decisive mood. We talked candidly. I said to them: "Your leap forward and your success forces not only you but everyone to move forward to some great cause. And if there is no one near you oppressing you, you have to step back so as to achieve jointly and at a measured pace not simply some paradise at one particular mine but profound transformations in our entire economy. Along the paths that we imagine entail movement toward a market economy, toward removing the state from our production. But this cannot be a matter for just one mine, nor even for the whole of Vorkuta!"

[Journalist] What do you have to say about a multiparty system?

[Afanasyev] The apparent moral and political unity has turned out to have terrible consequences for our society. We have reached a point at which the impossibility of further life in this condition is felt at all levels from productive labor to morality. It is clear that ideological-political, monolithic, granite-like unity is impossible. Only diversity can replace it. In this sense a multiparty system is more viable, more in line with the reality in any society.

[Journalist] How do you assess the work of our people's deputies from the Baltic, in particular those from Estonia, at the Second Congress?

[Afanasyev] As always, it is useful and necessary, a measure of active involvement, and in general I have a very good impression. But I do perceive some reserves here. I understand the contradictory nature of the situation in which the Balts found themselves at the Congress: They are thinking primarily about the wishes and instructions and interests of their own electorate. For them this is the priority. And bearing this always in mind, the are not very involved in the processes common for the Second Congress.

As a member of the interregional group I would rather that the Balts take a more active position in resolving other problems that are common to the Congress, and to the entire Soviet Union. I regard the Baltic deputies' dissatisfaction with the position as an objective contradiction. There is no evil intent in this, no malicious intent. I have no ready recipe for resolving this contradiction. I have spoken words of understanding to the deputies from the

Baltics, appealed to them: Naturally, it is difficult to dig even deeper the hole in which the country finds itself. And at the same time we cannot extricate ourselves one by one. We need a common effort.

[Journalist] What is your personal attitude toward the possible separation of the Baltic area from the Soviet Union?

[Afanasyev] When I heard this I was not surprised, although I do not think that there will be total separation. Some links will always remain no matter what happens, no matter how many years may elapse. Neighbors are neighbors, economically, culturally, and it seems to me that over time, economic links will even grow stronger. And with regard to the natural desire of the Balts to distance themselves from the center, there are a thousand and one reasons for this. There is politics and history and psychology and the family dramas, and the thousands upon thousands of ruined lives, and the forced existence within the framework of the USSR. There is also the quite outrageous method by which these peoples were made part of the Union. This can all be understood and explained. Not always justified, but they can and must be understood. I think that the contradictory movement of removing oneself from the center, if, of course, the process of democratization moves ahead normally in the country, is a movement toward the greater unification and integration that will definitely come about in time. It is a natural process that all humankind experiences. And we—the USSR as a Eurasian territory—are no exception. It is simply that for us freedom and independence have been so suppressed that now people need to feel that they are an independent state and a sovereign people just as much as they need air. It is felt in both the north and the south. And I still favor a situation in which, as they acquire their freedom and sovereignty, no people, not a single person should suffer and no one should be the worse for it.

[Journalist] The "blank spots" are not just appearing on the map of history. Thus, we learn about the activity of the interregional group mainly from the reports in the foreign press. The situation is no better with "Memorial," of which you are a member. Can you please throw some light on this.

[Afanasyev] I link the concept of the "Reign of Stalin" not only with Stalin. The "Reign of Stalin" showed the essential nature of that order, that regime. The following sentiment is expressed: It would not be a bad thing for us to move away from bad Stalin to good Lenin. I believe that this is a quite myopic thought. It would be much more productive and promising to recognize and find the Leninist essence of Stalinism. And so ridding ourselves of the reign of Stalin is very difficult. Its roots turned out to be stronger and deeper than we thought. It turned out that the dead can keep a hold on the living. It is only with difficult that we are ridding ourselves of the legacy of the "father of all the peoples."

We have a praiseworthy glasnost. But what is it that is good about it? It is simply the extension of the boundaries of what is allowed, which depends on someone's will. The mood may change, and then according to his favor or lack of favor, the limits will be narrowed or extended. But we sense always the lack of economic and legal structures that would enable us to make a real step toward glasnost and freedom of speech. And then we could say about the interregional group not only what our latter-day prophets from NASH SOVREMENNIK and those who are ideologically close to "Pamyat" permit us to say, but the members of the interregional group themselves could speak. They could talk about what they brought to the Congress, how they felt there, what the results of the Congress were from the standpoint of the interregional group. Yes, our group is a minority. In this Congress. It has become an opposition. What is this? Is it a basis for preventing it from speaking? For until now the minority has been suppressed in the spirit of the worst Bolshevik traditions. The Congress Presidium and the CPSU Central Committee leadership give it no respect, and they are demonstrating their inability to see and hear and pay attention to that minority. And they will not register "Memorial." It is almost a paradox, even though there is some movement toward registering the Moscow "Memorial." But so far not the All-Union "Memorial." It seems that the aims of the organization are of the purest kind: to perpetuate the memory of and help the victims of the Stalinist repressions. Nevertheless, while there is still a degree of trust in "Memorial" toward those authorities you will convince no one, and somebody will have doubts. Hundreds of All-Union public organizations have not been given the right of citizenship. There is no law about these kinds of organizations. And at the same time we have now had two congresses and two sessions of the Supreme Soviet but any law on this is being postponed and postponed. But unregistered public organizations do continue to function successfully. I refer to the CPSU Central Committee, the Komsomol and the trade unions. For they are also unregistered public organizations. However, they have their own teams and their own newspapers and their own premises. But "Memorial" does not have a room, or a newspaper, nothing.

[Journalist] What, in your opinion, will be the outcome of the "Gorbachev-Lithuania" dialogue?

[Afanasyev] I think that it will end peacefully. They have met and talked and clarified their attitudes. And Mikhail Sergeyevich has certainly sensed the mood, particularly his comrades who have traveled to Lithuania. They no longer have any illusions that someone must give something to the Lithuanians; no, it was the Lithuanians themselves who hit on the idea. This is useful. And the fact that the Lithuanians listened to Mikhail Sergeyevich is no small thing. Finally, after 40 years, for the first time a leader of the Soviet Union came to them; this was a major event.

[Journalist] How do you assess the development of Marxism-Leninism as a science in the years immediately ahead?

[Afanasyev] As an historian, for me, and probably for all historians, it is an inherent thing to try to see how particular trends develop and what stages they pass through. At least in some roles. This phenomenon of Marxism-Leninism is quite incomprehensible. Stop any person now and ask, "What is it?" And regardless of his education he will become engrossed in cogitation. There is nothing tangible in life. It is like moral-political unity: They used to talk about it a great deal but in life it did not exist. In general, our entire lives are made up of words while nothing can be found in actual reality. Of course, Marxism-Leninism as a state ideology is outdated. Marxism-Leninism as a vision of the world is still a vision of the world that was the pre-Borovskyian, pre-Einsteinian world vision of the 19th century, when the entire world thought of divided and opposed classes, and a struggle for a victorious outcome. The final victory was the destruction of someone by someone else. The dictatorship of the proletariat and social revolution as a transition from one state of society to another is a vision of the world that today is not consonant with reality, and accordingly Marxism-Leninism can invite us only into the 19th century, while we need an invitation into the 21st century. And finally, Marxism-Leninism is an aggregate of certain theories that have not been confirmed by social practice. For example, the theory of labor costs is not much in dispute among very many economists. The main thing in Marxism-Leninism has failed utterly to justify itself, namely, that capitalism as a system is coming to an end and that it has no prospects for society, is completely outdated. This was, properly speaking, the main idea in the teachings of Marx. It turns out that new stages have appeared in capitalism, and the opportunities for its self-development have turned out to be such that now no sensible person would dare to predict the end of this social system in the foreseeable future. I think that the works of Marx and Engels will remain, and as people of culture we shall always be in dialogue with them. Just as we maintain an eternal dialogue with Plato and Aristotle. We shall find in Marx and Engels things that will always enrich us, but as we engage in that dialogue we must see that it has not been confirmed by social practice, and that it relates to some forms of social utopia. Marx and Engels and Lenin were socialism utopians in many ways. I speak without any apprehension that I will be accused of iconoclasm, that I am speaking sedition. It is the normal recognition of a man of culture.

[Journalist] You are a communist. But in a democratic world what kind of party is close to your heart?

[Afanasyev] The question of affiliation to the CPSU is arising, or will arise. For some it has already arisen and they have decided against the CPSU. Why? The CPSU Program was deemed useless. The Rules were not to their liking. We were all part of some unknown party. And the question of whether or not they will be in the party is one that arises for every party member. We often say "CPSU" having in mind that that is the party. I have had serious doubts about that recently. That is, on the contrary, I am even convinced that the CPSU cannot be called a political party in the strict sense of the word. It is something else. Perhaps it is an aspect, a facet of our system, our regime. But the CPSU is nothing like a party of like-thinkers. It includes people with differing ideological convictions, different goals, people who see the general trend of our further social development in different ways. So that now it is very difficult to talk about the CPSU. There is some higher echelon of power, that is, those who are called "the party leadership and government." This is quite real. There is an apparatus, also a real thing. And there are 20 million ordinary people whom it is difficult to call a party.

[Journalist] What does the elimination of Article 6 of the Constitution mean for you?

[Afanasyev] It means that the procuracy and the courts are unable to be members of the party. That in the ministries that remain there should be no party committees. That there should be no party committees in production. That it is necessary to eliminate the political directorates in military units. Some say: Let us strike out Article 6. And what will follow? It will be necessary to realize the transfer of power from the party to the soviets.

[Journalist] Where have you been recently? What were your impressions?

[Afanasyev] I have been in Kazakhstan, Tatariya, and Siberia, and everywhere everything was very different. Of course, in Kazan the political pulse is more noticeable, stronger. Kazakhstan is a quagmire of stagnation, horribly perfected. Alma-Ata is still more or less the same but farther out there is very swampy territory.

And unfortunately, Russia does not seem to be in the best of shape.

All regions have now been stirred up on a nationalist basis, and of course, extremism has been seen. Including in the Baltic; the national is prevailing over the social. And it is the same everywhere. This can be explained. But in Russia the national is being displayed rather in the form of growing chauvinism. This wave is rolling over all these regions and the apparatus is directing it skillfully and supporting it. And it is not difficult to heat things up because Russia has been brought to a terrible state in all its relations, and here only a match is needed... Well, for example, they say: "In the Baltic everyone lives in fine cottages while here we have wooden huts, and not very good ones at that." Or: "The roads are fine there, but here we have no roads."

[Journalist] You said nothing about the situation in Siberia, particularly in the major industrial centers like Novosibirsk. Many doubtful innovations have been made there.

[Afanasyev] "Pamyat" is still strong in Novosibirsk. No, Russia seems very disorganized and asleep, and this is a pity. It seems to me that if the Russian source had been present in the establishment of democracy rather than on equal footing with other things that are even stronger and more noticeable, then like in the Baltic, everything there would have been different.

[Journalist] And there is no hope for change, that is the most terrible thing. Do you have any hopes for this?

[Afanasyev] What is gaining in strength now is only the sense of necessity. All these appeals by the Bondarevs, and Kunyayevs and Rasputins are terrible.

[Journalist] Is there any historical analogy to what it taking place there now?

[Afanasyev] Of course there are analogies. There is Weimar Germany, and Russia from 1905 to 1917. There are many analogies in the sense that the transition from totalitarianism to democracy is like that great gulp of freedom that we cannot now swallow and digest. A general disintegration is starting. There were reasonable leftist forces in Weimar Germany, and in Russia. But, first, they bickered among themselves and everything was very healthy, which is what is happening here. And an absolute gulf separated the left from the center, absolute lack of understanding, mutual recriminations and accusations. And then the inability to govern and the disturbances—Sverdlovsk, Azerbaijan.

Now the general inability to govern is occurring against the backdrop of a spectrum of different interests. A crisis of freedom—this is what it could be called. Precisely crisis—the inability to make use of freedom. There is more: The emergence of some strange leaders, from among the workers and from the intelligentsia. We also have this. For example, Yarin has emerged, supposedly a leader. Ideologies are emerging: Here we have NASH SOVREMENNIK, here a Richard Ivanovich (Kosolapov, former editor of the journal KOMMUNIST—author's note). As a rule the leaders come from the ultras on the left and the right. And there is one more analogy: They have never been taken seriously. For example, in Weimar Germany few took the heroes of the Bavarian beer cellars seriously. They waved their arms about, just as they did at the Bolsheviks. Apart from the irritation and the contempt, they experienced nothing. Ultimately it was precisely those from the beer cellars who assumed power.

[Journalist] The elections are now to take place in Russia. Do you think that the communists will fail or win?

[Afanasyev] No, they will not fail. I think that the democrats will emerge in these elections.

[Journalist] And what does Gidaspov represent?

[Afanasyev] He is on the extreme right. Like Yarin. Only they are different. One of them is a worker, the other a "military-party-management" person. I think that Gidaspov looks ahead. The elections will be different, they will not be some solid thing all over Russia. The apparatus has found a very powerful reserve, it is master of the situation. It seems to me that it has succeeded in stampeding the democratic candidates into particular places. And those who were quick to register in one place, re-registered in other okrugs on the last day. There will be a fight there too, but they will be fighting among themselves. To make up for this there is a semblance of alternate choices, a semblance of a fight, when actually the representatives of the party and state nomenklatura are virtually guaranteed passage. Even though this is not always the nomenklatura. And if we had the representation on a geographical basis, it seems to me that the situation would be even worse than in the elections for the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. There was some kind of unpredictability there,but still the democrats were scattered across the spectrum. But here, everything has been predetermined.

[Journalist] The viewpoint exists that the Baltic area will withdraw from the USSR this year...

[Afanasyev] No, I think that it will half-happen. Yes, in the sense that there will be political independence from Moscow. But it simply cannot withdraw in economic terms. And the West will not take it on. They could not take on East Europe at this time. And for everything within the borders of the USSR, they are saying let us wait a little. This is their most serious mistake.

(From the editor). We cannot agree with all of the assessments made by USSR People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev. Nevertheless, the editor does consider it possible to bring the most varied viewpoints to the reader.

Economic

Experts Discuss Development of Economic Reform

PM1502151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Dialogue Between Economic Leaders"]

[Text] A scientific and practical conference of graduates, students, professors, and lecturers from the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy was held in Moscow 12-14 February.

Leaders of economic and public organizations, enterprises, state management organs, ministries, and departments took part in its work.

There was a discussion of topical problems concerning the development of the radical economic reform and the implementation of the economic recovery program proposed by the government. The debate focused on new forms of economic activity, questions of implementing a modern social policy, planning, economic management methods, and the intensificatiion of foreign economic activity.

The conference participants were addressed by Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers; Academician A.G. Aganbegyan, rector of the

Academy of the National Economy; leaders of central economic departments; and eminent scientists.

The academy graduates were keen to share their opinions and experience, consult their colleagues, and discuss nontraditional approaches and methods in economic activity and production management. Debates on key points of social development took place in the course of "roundtable" meetings with the academy's professors, lecturers, and scientists.

They examined the academy's position in the modern system for training economic leaders and its influence on the implementation of perestroyka in economic management. The need to accelerate the process of renewing the corps of management cadres in the country and training new-type leaders was repeatedly expressed.

A constituent meeting was held to create an association of Academy of the National Economy graduates—leaders of state enterprises and public organizations. Its tasks are to pool the efforts and increase the creative contribution of academy graduates in leading economic positions in solving the most important problems of the country's socioeconomic development and in enhancing the skills of management cadres and their continuous professional education.

The association will cooperate with other organizations, associations and enterprises, and similar associations in the USSR and abroad. A statute was adopted, the association's leadership organs were elected, and the avenues of its activity were examined in detail.

Academician Supports Draft Economic Platform

PM1502153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Academician G. Arbatov: "Prestige of Power. Reflections on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] In the past few months and even weeks we have all felt more keenly than before that the pace of events and the situation in the country are literally running away from us. But time is becoming the most valuable and scarce political currency.

How will the inevitable profound changes proceed, how will the country get out of the crisis? In a regulated and civilized way without excessive costs, or wildly, with dangerous side effects, including outbursts of violence, extremism, and anarchy? These questions are being authoritatively raised by reality.

How can we ensure a safe option that is acceptable to society? Certain comrades who spoke at the recent plenum have already proposed a well-known option—a strong hand and a clampdown on anything that goes against the grain.

I do not want to resort to labels or turn the argument into one about morality and humanity. Perhaps such people would be more convinced by purely utilitarian arguments. For all their seeming effectiveness, a strong hand and despotic power ultimately represent a very shaky authority. Its entire structure is held up by a single bolt, so to speak. If that bolt is removed or broken, if it falls out by itself, the entire structure will collapse like a house of cards in a draft. And it often leaves behind a scorched desert of hard times and discord. History provides many examples—from Ivan the Terrible to Joseph Stalin in our own history alone. Other countries are no exception. The events in East Europe are a recent example of that.

Answering the critics of perestroyka, I would like to ask: What alternative did we have? Have they forgotten the dying K.U. Chernenko, who was gotten out of his hospital bed and led by the arm in front of the TV cameras? They recorded him for us and for the entire world as a kind of symbol of a declining and semiparalyzed great power. That was where the notorious "strong hand" ultimately led us (just as Ivan the Terrible's "strong hand" had once led a paltry pretender to the throne of Muscovy). And it was in vain that Comrade Anufriyev expressed confidence that, if the delegates to the 27th party congress had been reassembled in 1984, they would not have elected Chernenko. They would have elected him unanimously, and to the accompaniment of "applause and a standing ovation"—it would not have been people acting, but the "strong hand" system of which, judging by everything, Comrade Anufriyev is still enamored. I would also like to defend perestroyka and economic reform against those who ascribe abuses and corruption to it. Why are we forgetting about Rashidov? About Merdunov and the dirty deals in Krasnodar Kray, about "Okean" and the crimes of the bosses of the Moscow and Rostov trading system, or about the mafias of the Transcaucasus? Or, finally, about long-standing matters such as the affair of Captain Solyanik of the "Slava" whaling flotilla?

The only alternative to a "strong hand" is high prestige. The prestige of power. But, above all, democratically won prestige. In order to win such prestige today the party will have to engage in profound reform, perestroyka, and democratization. This alone can release the main source of its power—the support and active participation of the party masses in work.

The draft platform is an undoubted step in this direction. I support its proposals aimed at democratizing the political system and the party—to exclude Article 6 from the USSR Constitution at the party's own initiative, to abandon the monopoly position in society, to consent in principle to a multiparty system (I got the impression from speeches at the plenum that there were already representatives of at least two parties present in the auditorium), and to institute direct, secret, and multicandidate elections at all levels of the party leadership, including elections of congress delegates and others. These reforms are critically necessary.

The tasks of renewing society and the party are gigantic in both their scale and their complexity. Our experience of many years, along with the experience of more than a dozen other countries, has shown how many things need to be radically changed, rejecting the administrative-edict system that grew out of the war communism model of society's economic and political makeup. Unfortunately, for a long time we saw this model—whether mistakely or through coercion (and some of us still see it this way)—as the classic implementation of socialist ideals. That is why its roots are particularly deep.

Our vocabulary now includes the word "crisis." Crisis is an unpleasant word. But it is not a catastrophe and it is not death. Rather it is the traveling companion of evolutionary development and renewal if a society has been unable to rid itself in appropriate time of everything that is obsolete and impedes progress.

We are well aware of this as applied to capitalism. Now, alas, we are having to go through the same thing ourselves. This makes it possible to draw certain analogies.

In the late twenties and early thirties capitalism found itself in a severe crisis. The attempts made in certain countries to get out of that crisis by taking the path of totalitarian dictatorship, war, and imperial chauvinism led them to a complete catastrophe which, regrettably, claimed many victims in the rest of the world too.

A different approach prevailed in the United States. People over there realized that the only way out of the crisis was with the help of radical reform, democratization, and what we now call perestroyka. This—Roosevelt's "New Deal"—also encountered great difficulties. It was opposed by the immense power of inertia and resistance from conservatives, right-wing and left-wing populists, and extremists. Roosevelt and his supporters were slammed for "conniving with radical troublemakers" and for "flouting sacred principles" (the principles of "Americanism").

But the "New Deal" triumphed. And it saved capitalism. Although this capitalism was different from the kind described by Marx and Engels in the 19th century or by Lenin in the early 20th century.

Incidentally, this historical parallel answers the bewildered questions of those of our comrades who are surprised that many people in America and West Europe should say that the success of perestroyka is in their interests. What was in our socialist interest back then: for things in America to reach the point—as they had in a number of European countries—where fascism and militarism triumphed, or for the "New Deal" to prevail, even though it was aimed at saving capitalism? World War II showed just how much the latter alternative was in our interests. In whose interest is it today for there to be an upsurge in passions, anarchy, or violence in any country? All the more so when there are dozens of nuclear power stations around and huge quantities of deadly weapons have been amassed?

Exaggerating the difficulties that await us would, however, be no less dangerous than belittling them. Above all in the economy. Yet this danger exists.

Many economic leaders and some academics are trying to persuade us that during the economic reform the people and the country will inevitably have to make more and more sacrifices for a long time to come, and that "things will get worse before they get better." This way of thinking confuses me. And not only because there is not that much scope left for things to get worse. I simply cannot understand the logic by which everything is supposed to get worse when elementary economic order is brought about in a generally rich country which has everything necessary for a normal life but has been almost brought to its knees by mismanagement.

People try to persuade us that this is inevitable, since the radical economic reform will take a considerable time. That is so—particularly if we continue to put up with delays, hold-ups, backtracking, and even sabotage.

But for all this it is not the lack of a law on ownership or a land law that is preventing us from resolving the elementary task drawn from the school arithmetic textbooks of how to get goods produced or bought abroad from point A to point B. And I can provide no explanation save a complete loss of management over the economy and a striking absence of personal responsibility for these failures. The same thing applies to the disgraceful position in the area of distribution, into which a large proportion of the output we produce—including the goods in scarcest supply—disappears as if into a "black hole." This also applies to the decline in municipal services "from Moscow to the other end of the country." It also applies to the shortage of disposable syringes. And it applies to a multitude of other elementary but very important problems.

It seems to me that no substantial importance has been attached to this aspect of things—precision, professionalism, and the elementary ability to manage and to solve problems both "high up," lower down, and at the lowest level.

Instead proposals are often made which again essentially shift the burden of failure onto the population and those who find life hard enough already—these proposals amount to virtually confiscating money from the population.

For instance, the version claiming that the collapse in the market occurred because the "money supply" considerably exceeded the supply of goods and that this gap is getting bigger has virtually become official. I will not dispute the obvious—that a supply of money which exceeds, and considerably exceeds, the supply of goods (that is, an excess of demand over supply) is bad for the market and bad for the economy. I resolutely object to something else: the attempts to pin the blame on those who earn more than they used to (despite our poor wage scales and rising inflation) while absolving the real culprits—those who are unwilling or unable to ensure production growth.

And the growth in the money supply bears no direct relation to the catastrophic increase in the list of scarce goods. Even if we all became millionaires tomorrow, our demand for potatoes, cabbage, milk, tea, biscuits, sweets, soap, and razor blades—which are all in scarce supply—would hardly increase that much. The reasons for this are quite different, and therefore the confiscation of people's earnings in any of the forms that are sometimes depicted as a panacea or the core of "emergency measures" to improve the economy cannot provide a way out of the situation. Such measures will do nothing but undermine the state's prestige, increase social tension, and undermine all the plans to step up the role of material incentives.

This also applies, in my view, to the proposal on monetary reform, which—as the plenum showed—has influential supporters and, incidentally, opponents. I would like to add just one idea to the arguments advanced by the latter. Is a state (and one wanting to become subject to the rule of law, at that) really entitled to take such a tyrannical step as confiscating money from the population by executive order? Such a measure is only acceptable under exceptional circumstances (war or revolution). It should not be used to solve problems which have arisen because of bad management, mistakes, and economic leaders' incompetence and lack of talent.

All the more so as there are realistic, long-term, and legal solutions. The main solution is to radically cut state spending. This continues to be insanely wasteful—hundreds of billions are still being thrown away on unnecessary capital construction, on the production of unnecessary goods, on excessive military spending, and on maintaining an overblown apparatus, or are lost as a result of huge assets being frozen in the shape of so-called above-normative stocks at enterprises, "never-ending" construction projects, and other losses. It is, I repeat, a question of many hundreds of billions of rubles. And it is out of line for the Finance Ministry to try to rectify this orgy of wastefulness by indulging in an orgy of taxes, various charges, and levies which threaten to simply ruin the country.

We do have ways out of our difficulties. We must not frighten ourselves and others. Otherwise we will just demoralize the people and destabilize the situation. And, moreover, the whipping up of pessimism and the exaggeration of difficulties are a convenient and easy way to cover up the responsibility of bad economic leaders and useless, incompetent workers. And to justify the slow progress on restructuring in practice the economy and the styles and methods of economic management.

Government Reviews AUCCTU Price Appeal

904F0085A Moscow TRUD in Russian 10 Feb 90 p 1

[Article by TRUD political columnist V. Golovachev: "The Government Has Reviewed the Protest of the Trade Unions"]

[Text] It seemed that an echo of passions burst into the Oval Hall of the USSR Council of Ministers building, an echo that had reached a high pitch in enterprises of the country in connection with the decision to raise rates on freight shipments and electric power in industry and to increase wholesale prices for diesel fuel. The discussion at the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers on this question, which troubles millions of people today, was heated, concerned, and principled. The increase in wholesale prices and rates placed collectives in a difficult position, because the funds of enterprises started to decrease catastrophically, and there was a threat of lowered wages.

Telegrams and appeals are arriving at the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and the trade union committees in an endless stream. TRUD has already reported that, in connection with the acute situation that has set in, the AUCCTU sent a letter to the government in which it resolutely supports the well-founded demands of the collectives about the compensation for losses connected with the increase in wholesale prices and rates. We also explained in detail about the work of the interunion trade union commission that was established at the end of January. The commission instructed the leadership of the AUCCTU to bring the opinion of the work collectives and trade unions to the attention of the USSR Council of Ministers, with a request to report the decision of the Council of Ministers by 5 February.

And so the AUCCTU appeal is being reviewed by the government. USSR Minister of Finance V.S. Pavlov reported that the increase in rates for freight transport was made for the purpose of increasing the economic concerns of enterprises to use transport efficiently, to reduce the irrational use of shipments, and to create sources of additional resources to finance urgent measures needed to accelerate the production and social development of transportation. The increase in wholesale prices for diesel fuel should eliminate its wasteful application in boiler-furnace units. As for the increase in rates for electric power, it was brought about by the necessity to compensate for losses resulting from a reduction in payments for electricity in rural locations.

The minister of finance reported that, in connection with the requirement of the trade unions, the USSR Ministry of Finance, at the end of January and the beginning of February, reviewed the state of affairs at metallurgy enterprises and found an opportunity to compensate them 700 million rubles [R], and seven concerns of the association "Soyuzstroymaterialov" [Union of Building

Materials]—R85 million. A transfer was made to consumer cooperative enterprises of R302 million and to trade—R620 million. Other examples were also cited at the meeting. This work will be continued with other branches of the national economy as well.

At the same time, as was noted at the meeting, enterprises will not be compensated for those losses of profits that are associated with incomplete use of capacities, a lowering in the volume of products, and nonfulfillment of tasks to reduce the expenditure of resources.

Thus, the arguments have been stated, and the situation has been delineated. The discussion began. USSR ministers and deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers spoke. Serious concerns about the negative consequences of the measures that were taken were expressed. The question was put bluntly, including that by S.A. Shalayev, AUCCTU chairman, about why a thorough analysis of the possible consequences was not conducted in a timely way during the preparation of this and some other decisions. The necessary consultations were not conducted with the ministries, the trade unions, and work collectives. As a result, a tense situation emerged which, even without this, complicates today's already difficult life. Was it not really possible beforehand to think of questions about compensation and to give appropriate explanations in order not to incite an unnecessary outburst of emotions and tension?

S.A. Shalayev emphasized that the situation is extraordinary in many work collectives. A very heavy burden has been placed on them. And while the trade unions treated with great understanding the need to raise insurance fees to resolve the problem of minimal pension scales, the growth of wholesale prices and rates for a total of more than R17 billion is not only excessive, but simply intolerable.

"Comrade Pavlov inaccurately and incorrectly declares that all of this was coordinated with the trade unions and the USSR Supreme Soviet," continued S.A. Shalayev. "However, questions of the specific increase in wholesale prices and rates were not discussed either at trade union organs, or in the USSR Supreme Soviet and its commissions."

On behalf of the AUCCTU, serious criticism was directed against the government for an inefficient review and resolution of questions that were raised in trade union appeals, and specific proposals were introduced on compensation for losses by enterprises and in construction.

Summing up the results, L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who conducted the meeting, apologized on behalf of the government for the delay in answering the AUCCTU and the interunion trade union commission, and he talked about those miscalculations that were committed during the preparation and approval of documents on these questions. The Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers instructed the USSR Ministry of Finance to define a precise system of compensation for losses in connection with the introduction of new rates and individual wholesale prices, taking into account the discussion that was held on this question. It was directed that this work be conducted jointly with concerned ministries and with the participation of trade union central committees. Since this work is not yet completed, it was decided to stop payment into the budget for a certain period of those additional sums that were brought about by an increase in prices and rates.

Today, Saturday, representatives of the government are meeting with the AUCCTU, and they will report on the results of the review of the demands of work collectives at the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers and the decision that was reached.

Joint Venture Performance Assessed

90UI0355A Moscow TRUD in Russian
8 Feb 90 p 3

[Article by B. Kheyfets, candidate of economic sciences: "Joint Ventures: Paradoxes of Cooperation"]

[Text] **The first joint venture in the USSR with foreign partners was registered in May 1987. Exactly two years later, 500 joint ventures appeared on the register of the Ministry of Finance. Now they already number more than 1,300, not counting branches.**

But is such a rate of growth sufficient? By comparison, about 20,000 enterprises with foreign capital participation were created in the last five-year period in China. And their number continues to increase.

Are there rational boundaries of joint enterprise? Is it necessary to provide further incentives to this process in the USSR? To determine this, it is necessary to answer at least two more questions honestly. First, what will promote their creators, both Soviet and foreign? Second, what do joint ventures give or what should they give our country?

The interests of foreign partners are clear—they are looking for profit, new markets, sources of raw materials, skilled but cheaper manpower, technical ideas, tourism opportunities, and so forth. And not all of them harbor hopes of immediate success. The particularly farsighted ones agree to certain costs in order to gain a foothold in the market and not end up "out of the game." For this, they are even willing to endure difficulties of working with Soviet partners and inconveniences of daily life.

There are also among foreign businessmen those who sincerely sympathize with our perestroyka, even patrons of the arts, willing to invest money for the sake of realizing humanistic ideas or to leave fond memories of themselves. Among the latter there are quite a few old emigres, about whom we are now beginning to speak of as civilized people.

There are also undisguised adventurists among the foreign partners, striving practically without any expenditures on their part to get rich at the expense of an inexperienced partner (and where to get real experience but in a country isolated from the outside world for so long?!).

You also cannot help but see the desire of a number of foreign partners to develop ecologically "dirty" production facilities, the path to which is closed in their countries. For example, these include the much talked about joint projects in Tyumen Oblast and the Tengiz Project. But is this Western "aggression" or our irrational structure policy? Really, aren't we ourselves creating such production facilities, and using less modern technologies and sometimes simply burning valuable raw materials?

As far as Soviet participants are concerned, given all the diversity of their interests, most inherent for them is the desire to gain new opportunities for their development and...break away from the fetters of the command-administrative system.

Indeed, the functioning mechanism of joint ventures is more aggressive compared to domestic enterprises. In particular, this concerns the formation of a production program and assets, including the material incentive fund, choosing suppliers and buyers, and the possibility of establishing contract prices. In addition, joint ventures are exempt from profit tax for the first two years, and in the Far East for the first three years, from the moment marketing of products begins. Later, regardless of the directions of their activities, a relatively low profit tax rate is established for them—30 percent, and as low as 10 percent in the Far East. There are also many advantages in the foreign economic sphere, including an exemption from licensing of products and currency deductions to the state budget, and customs privileges when importing equipment and other goods for the needs of the venture and its personnel.

Moreover, joint ventures have an opportunity more often to send employees on foreign business trips more, to acquire elegant foreign cars and fashionable consumer goods, to grant high salaries, and so forth. We also should not rule out the prestige considerations, alluring even for large state enterprises, not to mention the cooperatives that are in "disfavor."

Therefore, the desire of a Soviet organization, restricted by current legislation, to create joint enterprises is not surprising, sometimes even at the expense of making concessions to the foreign partner or without a sufficient study of the prospects of the joint activities. These are precisely the shortcomings that opponents of joint ventures point out, using this (as well as the struggle for social justice) to conceal their not unfounded fear of being deprived of the levers of power. After all, joint ventures are not subordinated to command from above. You cannot be treated the way cooperatives and domestic enterprises are treated, changing laws adopted the day before.

It is still hard to determine the effect of joint ventures on our economy. According to estimates, so far only one out of every five or six is really operating. You see, the creation of a number of ventures assumes the development of a serious production base. So an appreciable impact from them cannot be expected until 1990-91.

Obviously, that is why the press often contains criticism of the joint ventures. In particular, they complain about the distribution: about 30 percent of the total number are ventures engaged in trade, consulting, and engineering services, and training managers; 15 percent are associated with tourism and movie and video services; 13 percent are involved in developing computer programs and in assembling and servicing computer equipment. And this is with the small number of producers of scarce finished products that can strengthen the export potential and raise the technological level of industry.

But how long will we treat services as a secondary sector, including services of a production nature, without which the production of modern products is inconceivable. Moreover, no one is keeping us from providing incentives for the emergence of joint ventures we need, granting them favorable terms as is being done in China, for example, for advanced technology ventures.

Dissatisfaction is also being expressed over the the small number of economically powerful joint ventures: about 60 percent of all ventures account for those having assets from 100,000 to 1,000,000 rubles; only seven have assets over 10 million rubles. However, they do not take into account that throughout the world medium and small business play an important role, actively filling their "niches" in the economy. Let us be fair—is it wise on the part of foreign firms to risk large amounts of capital given that our still unstable economic policy and given the absence of a nationwide law protecting foreign investments?

Nevertheless, joint ventures are already making a real impact. According to data as of the end of 1989, they sold 446 million rubles worth of products on the domestic market and exported 70 million rubles worth of products, while domestic exports (sale for convertible currency within the country) amounted to 89 million rubles. Joint ventures such as "Lenvest (producing 1 million pairs of shoes), "Khomatek" (manufacturing machine tools), "Sovplastital" (producing organic synthesis products), "Interdvadro" and "Dialog" (developing computer programs) have gained notoriety. In Moscow and Leningrad, joint restaurants and pizzerias have appeared that also operate on rubles. There are plans to create a large Soviet-Italian venture in Yelabuga to produce 300,000 passenger cars a year.

Of course, there are also those among the registered joint ventures today that, it looks like, will simply go bankrupt in the near future. We must act calmly to this—this is a natural process for a normal economy. When all is said and done, the organizers of these ventures and not the state will pay for the damage from their activities.

But how can we make joint ventures compatible and integrate them into the Soviet economy? After all, the economic system existing in our country, in essence, forcibly separates joint ventures. Our centralized material and technical supply cannot provide the ever-increasing number of them with the necessary raw materials, materials, and equipment. And the market means of production and wholesale trade are in a rudimentary state for now.

The fact that the ruble is not convertible and that it is impossible to effectively use profits received in rubles, strongly suppresses the attraction of foreign investments. It is not just a matter of a real exchange rate for our currency. The main problem lies in the possibility of acquiring the necessary goods in the USSR, that is, in the domestic convertibility of the ruble, which can ensure a market, in other words, a transition from fixed supply to free marketing.

A market in conditions of a worsening shortage of all goods? But this just aggravates the crisis. But what if, along with the rationing system of supply, we create a free market for raw materials, materials, and equipment based on a convertible currency (or new hard rubles) for joint ventures and domestic enterprises? Then they can sell part of their products within the framework of this same system, enriching it, to gradually replace the rationing system.

For the time being, the resolution of the many problems in the activities of joint ventures that are emerging in conditions of the administrative-command system that forcibly separates them depends on the "ties" of the founders of the ventures, and that means attracting not the most suitable but the most "needed" organizations and people. What not only gives rise to parasites, also places individual joint enterprises in a privileged position.

It would seem that there is no longer any need to prove that the development of joint enterprise, including abroad, and the active involvement of the USSR in the world economy are necessary for perestroyka. Autarky is backwardness, but foreign economic "opening" of the country gives serious guarantees of the irreversibility of the positive changes taking place in our country. Lenin once wrote that "a system of mixed companies is the only system that is able actually to improve a bad apparatus...for under this system both the foreign and Russian merchant work side by side. If we are unable even under such conditions to learn a little more, learn thoroughly, and learn completely, then our people are utterly hopelessly a people of fools."

We just must not demand from joint ventures that which they cannot give in today's conditions and shift our own difficulties to them. In order to participate successfully in joint enterprise, we must, not in words but in deed, make radical reforms in our economy and ensure pluralism and equality of the various forms of economic management. Only then can we make joint ventures compatible with the national economic complex of the USSR and turn them into additional assistants in carrying out specific tasks in our economy.

Foreign Workers Complain of Food Shortage, Strike

904D0064 Moscow TRUD in Russian
13 Feb 90 p 3

[Report by V. Narinskiy (Dolinskaya) and afterword by I. Ostrovskiy (Dnepropetrovsk), 12 Feb: "What Ever Happened to Konstantin Rakaru's Dinner?"]

[Text] Miroslav Klasna, the leader of the Czechoslovak workers who are building the Krivoy Rog enrichment combine for oxidized ores (KGOKOR), reported at a recent meeting of the party staff:

"We have nothing to feed our people in the new year. The Soviets are not sending any food. The situation is hopeless, we might as well shut down the construction..."

He was supported by his colleagues, Konstantin Rakaru and Hans Hildebrant, the leaders of the Romanian and German builders.

They mentioned not only the shortage of food but also the constant interruptions in the deliveries of gravel and sand, the lack of fuel for diesel trucks and boilers, and the incomplete load on the Romanian contracting firm Arshor. But food products were still the main thing. There were 10,000 foreign builders who essentially wound up as hungry hostages at the most disorganized construction project in the country.

Let us return to history. When drawing up and signing the intergovernmental agreement, the former USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and Vneshstroyimport made the Ukrainian Ministry of Trade responsible for providing food and consumer goods for our foreign partners. That was a time when the republic could without difficulty not only feed these 10,000 people but also offer them a minimum of goods for Soviet money. Now customers are finding empty shelves in the stores. And therefore vehicles with Romanian license plates can be seen for hundreds of kilometers around—from Moscow to Simferopol. They are buying up everything they see. And there is no one to reproach. What is a foreigner supposed to do with our money? He cannot take it home as a souvenir, after all.

The current situation was brought about mainly by the typical passion for the priority construction of industrial objects. Since the first days of the construction of the KGOKOR, local authorities have been demanding that preference be given to the social sphere. No residual principles! First food enterprises, warehouses and bases, stores and schools, and housing. And only after these—factories of the combine.

But the directors, if one is to speak "undiplomatically," simply ignored these just demands. And the money intended for the development of the social sphere of the Dolinskiy Rayon center, where the combine is being built, was spent long ago to upgrade the facilities of Krivoy Rog.

The attitude of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Construction toward the project was based on the behavior of the clients, the masters of the future enterprise. It would be difficult to name any other project with an estimated cost of R2 billion that does not have its own construction industry base. The construction elements, concrete, sand, and gravel are shipped over hundreds of kilometers. In keeping with the estimate, more than R15 million have been allotted for the construction industry. The money has been spent right down to the last kopeck, but nobody knows on what.

And so it turns out that Krivoy Rog Oblast, which sacrificed more than 3,000 hectares of the best land for the combine, has ended up with nothing but a poisonous bouquet of unsolved problems.

The most crucial of them has to do with food for the foreign workers and local residents. This is nothing to be surprised at. The funds allotted by the state are turned over to the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Trade Administration and the Worker Supply Department of the Yuzhnyy ore enriching combine. With great difficulty they managed to find out that there was basically enough allotted to feed each foreign worker, and that if the construction project were to receive everything promised on paper, there would be no problem. But the simplest calculation shows that hundreds of tons of the best products are staying at the base of the Worker Supply Department and nobody knows what happened to the tasty delicacies—caviar, balyk [filet of sturgeon], cod liver, sprats. Is this not why the leadership of the combine is trying as hard as it can to repulse attempts on the part of the Krivoy Rog authorities to take charge of the food supplies?

"The notorious residual principle has largely been put into effect once again," says L. Deyneka, the first secretary of the Dolinskiy Raykom [rayon party committee]. "People in our rayon center are getting fat, and the primitive dairy and bakery cannot handle their demand. And what do we have to trade with if the supplies are in the neighboring oblast? The director of the combine under construction, V. Yelezov, has already received two party reprimands. We are demanding that his deputy, A. Rybalko, be fired. How much more proof is needed of the bad situation at the construction project and the complete neglect of the interests of the workers and their mass dissatisfaction?

V. Narinskiy (Dolinskaya) (TRUD volunteer correspondent) **Afterword: During the time it took to prepare this article for print the situation at the international construction site has changed drastically. At the end of last week the Romanian workers, having lost their patience, went on strike. Their main demands are improvement in food, higher wages, the possibility of buying Soviet goods with rubles, and the right to take their earnings to their homeland.**

I. Ostrovskiy (Dnepropetrovsk) (TRUD correspondent), 12 Feb

Scientific

TASS Reports Experiments Aboard Mir Spacecraft

Future Experiments

LD1302103190 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 13 TASS—The Soyuz TM-9 space ship, with two cosmonauts on board, docked with the Mir space station at 9:38 Moscow time today.

Soyuz TM-9 mission commander Anatoliy Solovev and flight engineer Aleksandr Balandin joined Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov aboard Mir.

After nearly a week of joint experiments, Viktorenko and Serebrov will return to earth on the Soyuz TM-8 craft.

Solovev and Balandin will stay five and a half months on Mir to continue experiments begun by previous crews, geophysical and astrophysical research and biotechnology projects.

In April, the Kristal (crystal) specialised technological module carrying equipment for astrophysical, geophysical and biotechnological research will dock with Mir.

Solovev and Balandin will use the new hardware to conduct research into various materials and manufacture pilot improved- quality semi-conductors for the electronics industry.

Mir systems are working normally, according to mission control.

The crew has begun implementing the flight programme.

Biological Experiments

LD1402180690 Moscow TASS in English 1145 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 14 TASS—Four Soviet cosmonauts continue working aboard the Soviet Mir station for the second day.

The scientific part of the joint flight includes medical, biological and biotechnological experiments. Anatoliy Solovev and Aleksandr Balandin continue to acquaint themselves with the station's equipment.

The cosmonauts are already working on the electrophoresis installation Ruchei [word as received] as part of the biotechnological research programme. Their aim is to work out basic technique to clear insuline in conditions of microgravitation.

The new crew that arrived at the Mir station is carrying out a series of medical experiments to assess the state of the human organism at the initial stage of adaptation to weightlessness and to define the efficiency of preventive means used during this period.

Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov who are preparing to return to earth will train to use the pneumatic vacuum suit Chibis.

The cosmonauts have started experiments with biological material delivered to the Mir station by "Soyuz TM-9." It includes higher plants, the animal and plant tissue cultures and amphibia.

Cosmonauts Viktorenko, Serebrov, Solovev and Balandin feel fine.

Military

Yazov, Lizichev Attend Army Komsomol Plenum

PM1502154990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 90 p1

[Unattributed report: "Army Komsomol: We Are Going to the Congress"]

[Text] The first plenum of the All-Army Council of Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Organizations completed work yesterday at Moscow's "Olimpiyets" International Youth Center. Its participants—delegates to the 21st Komsomol Congress from the Armed Forces—discussed the problems and current tasks of the Army Komsomol.

The plenum elected the All-Army Council of Komsomol Organizations.

D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister; V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee; and A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; took part in the work of the first plenum.

Critics of Military Action in Azerbaijan Assailed

PM1502150590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Feb 90 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Azerbaijan: Are the Conclusions Objective?"]

[Text] A number of newspaper articles have recently cast doubt on the need to declare a state of emergency in Baku. It is claimed in particular that the excesses on the eve of the declaration of the state of emergency were subsiding and that there was virtually nobody left to be the object of those excesses, since all the Armenians had left. Does this square with the truth? A TASS correspondent put that question to Lieutenant General B.K. Smyslov, first deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops:

The facts show that excesses continued right up until the state of emergency was declared. In particular, pogroms were recorded 16, 18, and 19 January—the number on each date being 64, 42, and 43 respectively. Dozens of Armenians received physical injuries of varying severity. Fatalities also occurred during this period. The local law-enforcement organs were incapable of stopping the pogroms and murders. Under these conditions only the declaration of a state of emergency was able to end the escalation of crime.

The authors of certain articles have claimed that the 12,000 servicemen in the city were allegedly unconcerned about what was going on. This does not tally with reality. First, by the end of 12 January the grouping of troops numbered 3,696. Second, under the conditions of nationalist hysteria, which peaked in mid-January, the internal troops together with law-enforcement organs independently put a stop to attempted murders and pogroms.

On 16 January the internal troopers and militia in Baku had prevented reprisals against 616 Armenians.

Mobile groups of forces went to give assistance when they received the first indications that it might be needed. When a crowd of around 3,000 hooligans began assaulting Armenian passengers at the railroad station, it was servicemen who protected the citizens.

Could the troops have been used more resolutely? If resolution implies the use of weapons and special [crowd control] gear, the answer is unambiguously in the negative. Azerbaijan's Supreme Soviet has not passed any legislative acts to provide a legal foundation for this. That is why we could not issue the personnel with special gear, let alone ammunition.

The servicemen themselves have often been targets for attack from so-called guerrillas, not to mention the anger shown by extremists in general against servicemen from the internal troops who are preventing criminal infringements.

The writers of the articles preferred not to notice all this. What is this? Lack of professionalism? Bias? I think that both of these are equally impermissible when it is a question of the complex, ambiguous, and highly acute events which are currently taking place in Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Three Sverdlovsk Servicemen Refuse Baku Posting

PM1502153790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 90 p1

[Report by S. Plotnikov, associate of the newspaper URALSKIY RABOCHIY: "The Officer Who Said No..."]

[Text] Toward the end of January servicemen from the Sverdlovsk Garrison were transferred to the Transcaucasus, to the Baku region. Three officers refused to leave for the zone, in which a state of emergency had been declared.

"I did two years in Afghanistan: I know what bloodshed and human casualties mean. Now, that war and the introduction of our troops have been recognized as a mistake. It may be that in six months or a year we will be saying it was a mistake to take our troops into Azerbaijan."

That was the stand taken by Captain Aleksandr Kalachev. Taking a stand is all very well, but in the Army, orders hold sway. But Kalachev believes that no one gave him any order. The two other "rebel" officers, Major V. Trofimov and Senior Lieutenant A. Charikov, are of the same opinion.

As military people, they know that an order of that nature must be issued officially. In their case, however, each received a telephone call from cadre services personnel, who **suggested** that they go to Baku to fill positions there.

"Naturally," Major Trofimov wrote in one of his explanations, "I understood that it was a question of voluntary participation in the events concerned."

This view has been indirectly confirmed by Justice Lieutenant Colonel M.I. Nikiforov, a member of the military prosecutor's office, who has said that he sees no grounds for bringing criminal charges against the "rebels."

However, the "rebels" have been given short shrift, with accusations of cowardice hurled at them. On 24 January the party committee of the military unit where political worker Charikov worked, adopted a decision to expel him from the party. An officer's court of honor was held the same day, which resolved to petition the command to dismiss Senior Lieutenant Charikov from the Armed Forces.

A report on Major Trofimov was also compiled for the same reason: for discrediting the title of officer. Kalachev, who had fought in Afghanistan, did not escape the officer's court of honor either.

All three officers have spoken about what is now usually called the "Tbilisi syndrome." This concept has many dimensions. It includes unlawful decisions resulting in tragic consequences, and attempts by leaders of various ranks to evade responsibility and put the blame on someone else. That is why any situation where the Soviet Army is drawn into participating in events like those in the Transcaucasus demands decisions of maximum clarity that are absolutely legal. Now, however, the command has instituted an inquiry into the case of one of the three "rebels," although the prosecutor's office has not yet become involved.

Estonian Draftees Evade Military Service

LD1402225290 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] Tallinn February 14 TASS—The VECHERNYY TALLINN newspaper reported that the Tallinn city council has decided to ban the participation of its executive bodies in the military service draft, allegedly referring to the law on the fundamentals of self-government and the Estonian labor code.

Military Procurator A. Gladilin said that this decision runs counter to the Soviet Constitution, the Estonian Constitution and some other legislation.

For instance, the resolution of the Estonian Supreme Soviet of December 6, 1989, "On the Organization of Military Service of Estonian Citizens", pointed to the need to escape excesses connected with the Soviet Armed Forces. The resolution of the Estonian Supreme Soviet "On the Historical and Legal Estimation of 1940 Events in Estonia" also did not abolish the previous normative acts, which have legal force in Estonia.

Officials' lack of respect for the law prompts disrespect for the law among populace.

The Military Procurator's Office has to examine cases involving several military men, who tried to shrink from the military service, believing the correctness of lawless acts by certain officials and leaders of the so-called Organization for the Fight Against "Occupation Forces" (as they began to describe units of the Soviet Army and Navy located in Estonia) and tried to shirk from the military service.

In fact, these men committed military crimes.

During and after the autumn draft the military Procurator's Office several times informed the Estonian Procurator's Office about people who failed to appear at recruiting offices. However, neither the procurator's office nor militia took any measures.

The "Geneva 1949" committee proclaimed itself a major "fighter" against the "occupation regime." Its Tallinn headquartes offers a "highly-skilled" consultation on ways to escape from military service.

All in all, over 100 draftees did not register at recruiting offices in Estonia. It is a warning to territorial law enforcement bodies that are still euphoric about the "Geneva 1949" Committee, which actually pushes young people towards committing crimes.

Reasons for Sinking of Nuclear Sub Debated

Differing Views Defended

90UM0294A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 90 p 4

[Article by A. Yemelyanenkov, USSR people's deputy and deputy editor in chief of SOBESEDNIK: "The Undercurrents"]

[Text] Following the dry lines of the TASS report on the loss of the nuclear submarine "Komsomolets" and 42 members of its crew, many central publications carried reports permeated by sorrowful and at the same time heroic pathos. Subsequently, representatives of the Navy command, reserve officers, and active-service submariners took the floor... Different, at times contradictory, points of view on the causes of the emergency were voiced; versions, suppositions, and guesses were born. At the same time, the journalists were showered with rebukes for being incompetent and covering the events in a biased or lopsided manner. There was no dearth of advice and rebukes to our industry and the Navy. The sound of disparate voices in the press which died down at times and then flared up anew reflected the unseen struggle which accompanied the proceedings of the State Commission for investigating the circumstances of the loss of the "Komsomolets." As reported, the commission was headed by General of the Army D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, CPSU Central Committee Secretary O. Baklanov, and Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman I. Belousov. The commission included the most experienced specialists in the field of designing, building, and operating combat vessels of this class. The task was set to analyze profoundly and comprehensively the direct and indirect causes of the loss of this unique nuclear submarine and, taking into account previous severe accidents, work out measures aimed at improving the entire situation in the submarine fleet.

Industry, the Navy, and specialized design organizations agreed with this approach to the issue. Why then the struggle, misunderstanding, and rebukes? I have been trying to sort out this complex situation for more than half a year now beginning with the day when a phone rang in the editorial office and two naval architects requested a meeting. They would have never brought themselves to do this before because, having dedicated decades to building nuclear-powered vessels, they used to rule out any contact with the press for obvious reasons and became accustomed to reporting their every step to their superiors. They brought themselves to do it at this time, perhaps, believing that they would be able to succeed in telling the entire truth no matter how bitter it happens to be and, perhaps, also relying on the credentials of the USSR people's deputy which I was handed the day before... This appeal also was a desperate gesture when all previous attempts to prove the obvious turned out futile and resentment boiled over in their souls...

However, resentment is putting it mildly. What develops is real malice and venom deep down. You devote eight years to this vessel beginning with laying it down and to berth and subsequently see trials, you study the layout and all peculiarities of the submarine. After that, you get to see how individual interested parties try to put up a smoke screen by emasculating the essence of work of the State Commission and adjusting its conclusions one way or the other...

Vladimir Mikhaylovich Chuvakin was the commissioning official in charge of this design, and he remembers many details associated with building it and subsequently transferring it to the Navy. Eduard Leonov, the check-out mechanic who went on the trials together with Chuvakin, distinctly remembers the day of berth trials.

"We did not conceal this fact then and now we say openly: There was an emergency—when we were going back we 'lost' the surfacing capsule. It was raised, and the design mistake was eliminated not only in the 'Komsomolets' but also in other submarines equipped with the surfacing capsule. The capsule was tested by an actual surfacing from a submerged position and showed its reliability when used for its immediate function. I did not happen to do it myself but Chuvakin did surface in the surfacing capsule with the test crew..."

Undoubtedly, my interlocutors who started the conversation with this admission were sincere and highly competent. However, both Chuvakin and Leonov who were officially enlisted to work in one of the sections set up by a decision of the State Commission expressed their disagreement with the conclusions proposed by the Navy leadership. Having refused to sign, they outlined their special opinion. The point of view of Chuvakin and Leonov was supported by Deputy Chief Designer D.A. Romanov. In brief, the essence of their demands was to advance the investigation from quasi-admissions to determining the real picture of the development of the accident and actions of the crew in the crisis situation.

They could not by any means agree with the hazy and reassuring wording of the Navy command concerning the fateful, atypical turn of events in the course of this accident, as well as with the statement that the "Komsomolets" was a submarine in a class by itself which was operated on an experimental and trial basis; on top of it, it was taken out to sea by the second crew which does not happen often. In a word, there are no reasons for broad generalizations and any concern for the entire submarine fleet.

Going along with these conclusions meant keeping everything as it is: The system of personnel training for submarine duty which exists in the Navy and is beginning to fail; well-established but inefficient procedures for the inter-cruise servicing and maintenance of the submarines which are due to the poor technical equipment and low professional standards of the shore technical services; mounting social problems on the bases...

"Signing it under the circumstances means going against your conscience." Having stopped for a moment, Chuvakin said the unexpected: "If the commission does not come to honest and profound conclusions one option will be left—to quit. I will not be able to design submarines anymore..."

Our first conversation turned out to be frank but not long. Several days later, it was to be continued at the office of CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov.

It looked like Oleg Dmitriyevich was waiting for this call. Having found what the issue was, he did not postpone the meeting. Captain First Rank Ye. Selivanov, until recently the commander of a nuclear submarine and currently the chief of a junior submarine specialist training school, was summoned to the Central Committee together with Chuvakin and Leonov. In 1984, there was a fire on Selivanov's submarine. There were fatalities.

Selivanov grilled himself for all of these fatalities more severely than even the strictest investigators, and he has been doing it to this day. How is a fire on a submarine to be prevented and how are the people to be kept safe? Can spontaneous self-ignition be prevented? Why do fires usually occur during the last days of self-contained cruises, before returning to base?

He has studied the literature on the subject, the description of various accidents and fires, and talked to many submarine commanders who have had fires like him...

He has sought out the addresses and visited many centers and leading research institutes of fire protection.

They have not particularly interfered with this search by Selivanov but they have not been in a hurry to give him real support either. Perhaps, some people in the command believe that the captain was shielding himself... At any rate, multiple attempts by Yevgeniy Nikolayevich to secure the restoration of his party membership after the criminal charges were dropped have been rebuffed by the Political Administration of the fleet.

He continued his research. Textbooks for the course of general chemistry appeared on his desk. He decided to figure out himself the characteristics of the gas composition of air in compartments because he did not particularly believe the authorities. What should the optimal oxygen content be? What is the role of other components in life-support processes? The "Komsomolets" fire and the loss of the submarine and 42 members of the crew made Selivanov confident that he could not stop at a halfway point. He did not know personally the submariners from Ye. Vanin's crew; however, he graduated from the Higher Officer Course in Leningrad together with the commander of the first crew, Yu. Zelenskiy.

...It so happened that in the office of O.D. Baklanov the naval architects Chuvakin and Leonov and a representative of the Navy, submarine officer Selivanov, turned out to be on the same side of the table. This became symbolic: They spoke from different positions and used different words but with the same common goal in mind: To find the truth in order to actually improve the situation.

Having attentively listened to all arguments and sought details of the facts and calculations brought up in the process, Oleg Dmitriyevich said in summation: We will have to deal with ambitions and have a serious fight. He asked to be prepared for this. "If we do not secure changes in the Navy on the occasion of the 'Komsomolets' we are not worth much..."

We were to meet yet again, but not in Moscow. By that time, an intermediate meeting of the commission had been held, and the results of work of the sections had been reported. Right at the meeting Minister of Defense D.T. Yazov decided to relieve N.I. Burkov, deputy chief of the Navy Search and Rescue Service, of his command which IZVESTIYA reported on 6 August without mentioning his name.

The mentality of popular rumors and that of the supreme command are strikingly similar. The main point is to find a culprit and pin all the blame on him. In the case of the "Komsomolets," the rescue services which could not remove the crew from the vessel in distress at a critical moment were that culprit. The evaluation of the actions of rescuers was harsh but just. However, is the case now closed? Why is the leadership of the Northern Fleet so careful to skirt the issues of crew training, professional education of the personnel, its skill in fighting for the survival of the vessel? After all, this is the root cause of the tragedy rather than the failure of the pilot of a rescue plane to accurately drop airborne life-saving devices that the sailors are not trained to use...

"The sinking of a deep-water submarine from a surface position is so vexing and painful that it is hard to express. This is shameful for us..."

The officers sitting opposite Chuvakin were in no hurry to contradict him. The meeting was well into its fourth hour, and the ashtray was full of butts. However, my interlocutors just could not stop talking. I listened with particular attention to the words of Captain First Rank Zelenskiy, commander of the first crew of the "Komsomolets."

He confirmed: "Commander Vanin's crew took a full course of training, the course which the documents envisage. However, the existing conditions for training are such that, without access to a vessel, second crews cannot train properly on simulators alone, all the more so for a submarine which did not have an analog... In a word, they studied the course but did not develop the skills. This is stool or, as they call it in the fleet, thwart training. I would agree that they knew the documents even better than we did but, pardon me, this knowledge is not keyed to your fingers. In a situation when you have to act instantaneously, when you get cold feet, your brain does not kick in, your subconscious is operative... "In here, your soul has to be firm, and fear should not be your advisor."

This is why when the newspapers write that "the submariners did all they could" this is merely a half-truth.

Ye.N. Selivanov joined the conversation: "I remember this statement. However, I would like to refer to something else now: Even at the stage of design, at the stage of building a vessel we should rule out the very possibility of a fire. A system of preventive measures has to be found..."

Chuvakin who was smoking a cigarette next to the window turned around abruptly:

"However, when a fire does happen you've got to know how to fight it. After all, you said yourself that fires on submarines are not our scourge only; the Americans are running into the same problems..."

Given this situation, we should not panic but should rather learn the lessons and draw honest conclusions regardless of whose interests are affected. However, attempts to cover things up quickly are still going strong. Instead of analyzing an accident thoroughly, the Navy tries to forget it as soon as possible: a submarine officer who dared to voice his opinion is branded in a collective letter an incompetent person who has betrayed the interests of the Navy and "is playing up to industry..."

These accusations leveled at the commander of the first crew of the "Komsomolets", Yu.A. Zelenskiy, are testimony to the fact that the officers who have signed the letter have no objective or complete information on the accident.

Selivanov snapped: "A person who cannot understand within a minute what is happening on a submarine has no business serving in the submarine fleet. The main command post of the vessel had at least 15 minutes to localize the fire in Compartment 7. However, the accident alert was sounded with a delay. The personnel did not assume their stations envisaged by the damage control bill in a timely manner, did not seal the compartments, and did not take other primary measures fully which should be executed without orders."

The procrastination which was allowed to occur at the outset predetermined the entire subsequent course of the accident. As the journal MORSKOY SBORNIK reported, the "Komsomolets" was equipped with powder gas generators—a special system which ensures emergency surfacing with propulsion shut down and electric equipment partially shut down. However, the main command post of the submarine gave a different command—to surface with the mechanisms operating.

Furthermore, high-pressure air (VVD) was pumped to blow the stern group of main ballast tanks; in contravention of the manuals, additional pipelines in the compartment on fire were used, and they burst: Their hot walls could not withstand the pressure. High-pressure air burst into the fiery compartment and created a blast-furnace effect. It was established that pressurization lasted 44 (!) minutes. What kind of pressure control in the compartments and the high-pressure air system could there be?! Temperature in the center of the fire rose to between 800 and 1,000 degrees centigrade. Compartment 7 and the tanks adjacent to it lost their sealing, and water burst into the hull...

This is indicated by the appearance of the trim. However, according to entries in the ship's log, due significance was not attached to it at the main command post of the vessel though the trim is noticeable even in pictures taken from a plane at around 1500. A further increase in the trim unavoidably brought about the loss of longitudinal stability of the floating submarine without sea cocks. This fact alone was reason enough to consider the situation of the vessel dangerous, prepare in a timely manner on-board life-saving devices, and order that the submarine be abandoned in an organized manner. However, the command for the personnel to prepare for an evacuation was not given until 1642. The nuclear submarine sank 26 minutes later, the trim by the stern being about 70 degrees, with its shut-down reactor, two torpedoes with nuclear warheads, as well as members of the crew who were left aboard or dead...

This view of the course of the accident is different in principle from the one outlined in the preliminary conclusion of the commission. However, this is the position of professionals who made the words of Socrates "Plato, you are a friend of mine, but the truth is dearer to me" their commandment. At our first meeting, they also made me promise that I would not take advantage of my right as a journalist to publish in the press until all other ways to determine the truth are exhausted.

This request was to be explained to me, to be sure, much later, by Vice Admiral Chernov, deputy chief of the Grechko Naval Academy. He, a most experienced submariner and hero of the Soviet Union, transferred to his teaching post from the position of the commander of a flotilla of submarines—the very flotilla to which the "Komsomolets" belonged. Chernov accepted this new vessel and led the trials himself. At times, he took risks trying to squeeze everything possible out of it; he also sailed as the senior on board during the first deep, 1,000-meter dive...

So, as Yevgeniy Dmitriyevich was leaving one day he said putting his hand on a leather file which was strapped tightly shut:

"In here, all things are called by their own names. If they do not want to see me and listen sympathetically I will still give this report—it is secret—to the commander in chief... There was a time when we sailed on the same submarine: Chernavin was the commander, and I was the chief mate. It seems we understood each other at the time. I would like to believe that we will understand each other this time."

The conversation took place on 28 December in the Hotel Rossiya in the presence of Yu. Zelenskiy. Zelenskiy, formerly the commander of the "Komsomolets", and currently the chief of staff of a unit, was summoned to Moscow along with Chernov to take part in yet another conference which CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov held. For the first time, we got to see at the same table those who designed the first deep-water submarine, those who built it, those who performed combat service aboard the vessel, and those who were meant to survive the icy hell of the Sea of Norway...

In opening remarks at the conference, the CPSU Central Committee secretary once again asked everyone not to lapse into the defense of only the brand of the plant or the Navy uniform, not to point fingers at each other, and to look for one's own shortcomings first of all. However, the very first speaker, Vice Admiral M.M. Budayev, made it understood that his command did not intend to abandon the position taken. The version stating that the situation on the "Komsomolets" required that the crew perform incompatible actions, that the outcome of the struggle for survival was a foregone conclusion, and the personnel virtually could not do anything was repeated almost verbatim. The speaker said that all other evaluations and points of view are probable in nature and have no bearing on the resulting conclusions and evaluations...

The Central Committee secretary had to interrupt Rear Admiral O. Yerofeyev, a flotilla commander, when he rose up and started making an angry speech against those who, supposedly, disparage the memory of the submariners fallen and still alive through irresponsible statements and publications in the press... Subsequently, rebukes addressed to the designers and shipbuilders started pouring in from the other end of the table: They did not take into account this, did not take care of that, and what came out was not a combat vessel but a collection of flaws... Commanders of nuclear-powered vessels said that, and there was some truth in these words. Design deficiencies and equipment failures are becoming an increasingly frequent factor on submarines; there have been three more accidents in the Northern Fleet since the April tragedy. However, the following is characteristic: The Navy leadership decided not to let the press know about the last one, in December. At issue is an accident on a nuclear submarine which was conducting inert launchings of ballistic missiles. Luckily, there were no fatalities. However, much damage was done to the sea area and adjacent territories.

Besides, how can we do without all kinds of emergencies if boys fresh out of vocational technical schools are sent to serve in the nuclear submarine fleet and on nuclear-powered guided-missile carriers. After all, it is not any easier to sail on a long independent cruise on a submarine than to go on a space flight—this is no exaggeration; this is what knowledgeable people are saying. However, are the guidelines for the selection of astronaut and submariner candidates comparable? Besides, hundreds of first-rate specialists from the Flight Control Center follow the flight of a spaceship which, as a rule, proceeds automatically. Who is going to double-check the skipper of a nuclear-powered vessel who goes with his crew out to sea and performs around-the-clock combat service for several months at a time?

A fleet newspaper asserts in the words of the skipper of a nuclear vessel: "The materiel and weapons of the submarine are as reliable as the people in the compartments in their capacity as specialists and strong-willed individuals." In the fall of last year, a test of the general educational standard of incoming cadet-recruits, high-school graduates, was administered at the junior specialist school which Ye.N. Selivanov commands. Mathematics, physics, and Russian-language assignments at a level of grades six through nine were offered. They were extremely simple; I saw them and solved them myself. I also saw a summary table with grades: They were almost solid "D's..."

Are we going to keep pretending that all is fine?

From the Archives of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA

The tragic date 18 June 1984 intervened between these two pictures.

On that date, a fire broke out on the submarine commanded by Capt. First Rank Selivanov.

Senior Missile Specialist Petty Officer Buyanov of Company 2, who had received a commendation from the commander for his exemplary service the day before was severely burned but survived. Thirteen other members of the crew died in the fire and of asphyxiation.

As a combat unit, the submarine missile carrier was preserved and returned to the base on the surface. However, the commander of the submarine was immediately relieved of his post and expelled from the party. Criminal charges were filed.

Only one persistent request of the commander was honored: to recommend for an award Warrant Officer Khudyakov. He was the one to see to unsuccessful attempts to put out the flames of the burning people, batten down the hatches, and prevent the spread of the fire to the stern compartments.

Letter From Crew Members

90UM0294B Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 90 p 4

[Open letter by former "Komsomolets" crew members B. Kolyada, S. Dvorov, I. Kalinin, and A. Kopeyko]

[Text] On 17 December 1989, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published the article "Eight Months Later." As we see it, the interview published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA was not objective, and it was written with insufficient competency. It betrays a biased approach not supported by facts which is particularly impermissible in the case of A. Gorbachev, the former commander of a nuclear submarine.

Indeed, the first nuclear-powered submarine [PLA] with a titanium hull was built many years ago. However, it will be quite an exaggeration to describe it as "alive and well" because in 1988 it was withdrawn from the combat assets of the Navy and scrapped. However, the "Komsomolets" was unique due to its ability to dive to a depth of up to 1,000 meters and remain there for a long time, which no PLA of the USSR Navy is capable of doing regardless of the material it was made of.

Indeed, all of us were certain until the last minutes that we would succeed in rescuing the submarine.

We know just as well as Reserve Captain First Rank A. Gorbachev about an accident aboard a Soviet submarine in the sixties, and we did not rule out the possibility of this outcome. In the course of the entire accident, the status of the vessel was evaluated almost continuously.

Undoubtedly, a thorough analysis of the causes of the accident and the course of events has once again raised a number of issues and acute problems for scientists, designers, industry, and the submarine personnel. The personnel of our unit has developed and submitted a set of specific proposals for improvements, changes in the design of many systems and mechanisms, primarily those ensuring the endurance of submarines and enhancement of the quality and reliability of material.

Currently, the development of the accident and actions of the crew in the struggle for endurance are evaluated on the basis of the final result, proceeding from certain initial data. Both the specialists and the journalists proceed from the opposite. In the process, the actual, extraordinarily extreme and contradictory situation that emerged in the damaged compartments of the PLA and on the vessel as a whole is virtually not taken into account.

The absence of a comprehensive system for evaluating the situation in the damaged compartment on the basis of objective data on the vessel, especially in the event the personnel are absent or incapacitated, initially made it impossible to evaluate the situation in the damaged compartment.

The loss of control of some systems and equipment and means of propulsion of the vessel from central consoles and disabled communications with the damaged compartments brought about the deterioration of the situation on the vessel.

Putting it mildly, the assertions by Comrade A. Gorbachev concerning the standard of crew training are far-fetched. We took a full course of combat training, prepared for several years for our independent "big" cruise, studied at the Navy Training Center, passed course tests with good and excellent grades, and performed combat exercises.

Our training was carried out in complete compliance with guiding documents. Naturally, we worked on the issues of struggle for endurance; we checked life rafts. However, due to their design deficiencies they did not perform their rescue functions. We also tested the surfacing capsule in advance.

The personnel carefully studied the system operation experiences of the first crew.

Just because we were on our first extended cruise does not testify to our poor training.

Comrade Gorbachev also knows full well that, regardless of training, a senior who has extended-cruise experience always accompanies the commander on the first cruise. This is why the deputy commander of the unit was on board the vessel.

Indeed, it does happen in real life that crews have to be put together within days. However, Comrade A. Gorbachev knows full well that, first, this is due to acute necessity (sudden illness, family affairs); second, such cases are very rare.

In summation, we would like to say that we did not intend to make a statement in our press prior to the completion of the work of the government commission. However, the publication in the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, which was prepared without profound expertise, on the tragedy of the PLA "Komsomolets" and the heroic (we are not afraid of this word) death of our comrades made us uneasy.

We are compelled to state with bitterness that the notions of military duty, dignity, honor, and loyalty to the Motherland are disappearing from the vocabulary of journalists. We would like to ask V. Yunisov: "Who needs this article and why write it when the government commission was still establishing the cause of the accident?"

[Signed] On behalf of the surviving crew members of the submarine "Komsomolets", B. Kolyada, S. Dvorov, I. Kalinin, A. Kopeyko

Deputies Ban Health-Risk Military Facility

PM1502165990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Oleg Stefashin dispatch: "Deputies Closing Down Military Facility"]

[Text] Dzhezkazgan—Deputies at an extraordinary session of Dzhezkazgan Oblast Soviet made an unprecedented decision banning a military subunit stationed in the immediate vicinity of the oblast center from making any further use of the military facility. The session also demanded of the supreme Army leadership that the facility be immediately redeployed.

"We realize," Ye. Yezhikov-Babakhanov, chairman of the oblast soviet and first secretary of Dzhezkazgan Party Obkom [oblast committee], said when commenting on the decision, "that we have virtually 'disarmed' a facility of defense importance. This is certainly an extremely risky measure, but what was left for us to do? The situation in the city has been exacerbated to a point where the most unexpected events could occur at any moment."

What is at issue? It appeared that many years ago, disregarding the local authorities' opinion, the Ministry of Defense sited, right next to the city with its many thousands of residents, some radar installations whose constant operations have a dangerous effect on people's health. Later on the oblast leaders repeatedly asked the command of the former Central Asian Military District to move them further away, but every request was followed by a refusal. What has all this led to?

Staff members of the sanitation and epidemiology service established that it is becoming simply impossible for people to continue living in a zone which is subject to the effect of electromagnetic waves—on some days the radiation strength is many times in excess of the norms. Many residents' health has deteriorated to such an extent that all construction work here has had to be suspended. Of course, it was impossible to continue like this.

Hundreds of people driven to desperation assembled a few days ago at a rally and demanded that the local authorities put an end to the arbitrary rule by the military department and save the population from its dangerous neighbor. The deputies fully backed their voters.